

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXVII

MAY, 1949

No. 4

THE CAHOKIA ANNIVERSARY

Joseph P. Donnelly

JUAN DONOSO CORTÉS—SPANISH CATHOLIC LAYMAN

Thomas P. Neill

THE FORTY-EIGHTERS AND THE ELECTION OF 1860

Jasper W. Cross, Jr.

THE "PRISONER OF STATE" AND ITS AUTHOR

Benjamin J. Blied

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Saint Louis University

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

50 cents a copy

\$2.00 a Year

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A SERVICE QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXVII

MAY, 1949

No. 4

Editor

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

Editorial Board

THOMAS L. COONAN
JASPER W. CROSS
ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI
JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

LAURENCE J. KENNY
THOMAS P. NEILL
PAUL G. STEINBICKER
HERBERT WEINSCHER

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri. THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the CATHOLIC BOOKMAN and THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE CAHOKIA ANNIVERSARY	75
<i>Joseph P. Donnelly</i>	
JUAN DONOSO CORTÉS—SPANISH CATHOLIC LAYMAN	77
<i>Thomas P. Neill</i>	
THE FORTY-EIGHTERS AND THE ELECTION OF 1860	79
<i>Jasper W. Cross, Jr.</i>	
THE "PRISONER OF WAR" AND ITS AUTHOR	81
<i>Benjamin J. Blied</i>	
COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR	89
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES	91

CONTRIBUTORS

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY, S.J., A.M., Ph.D., is associate professor of history at Saint Louis University. Since his last contribution to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN he has published *A Tentative Bibliography for the Colonial Fur Trade in the American Colonies: 1608-1800*, and more recently *The Parish of the Holy Family, Cahokia, Illinois, 1699-1949*.

THOMAS P. NEILL, A.M., Ph.D., is associate professor of history at Saint Louis University. His latest work, *Makers of the Modern Mind*, will be reviewed in the next issue of THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN.

JASPER W. CROSS, JR., A.M., Ph.D., is assistant professor of history at Saint Louis University.

BENJAMIN J. BLIED, Ph.D., is professor of history at Saint Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He has published much on the history of the Civil War.

The Cahokia Anniversary

Joseph P. Donnelly

Saint Louis University

DURING the two weeks of May 15 and 22, 1949, the little village of Cahokia, Illinois, celebrates two hundred and fifty years of continuous existence. The event is to be marked with fitting ceremonies which will include a solemn pontifical Field Mass in the presence of His Eminence Cardinal Stritch of Chicago, civic celebrations at which state dignitaries will be present, and a pageant which promises to attract wide attention. While the great antiquity of Cahokia is no surprise to the historian, the fact that we have a settlement on the banks of the Mississippi which is not too many years younger than many of the old towns of New England and contemporary in its foundation with settlements in Pennsylvania and Georgia comes as something as a surprise to the average citizen who conceived of everything old in our country as pertaining to the eastern seaboard. For that reason, as well as for the fact that Cahokia's celebration deserves more than passing mention in the *HISTORICAL BULLETIN*, a magazine whose editorial work is done within sight of the village, the outlines of Cahokia's past are repeated here.

The foundations of the village have something of a unique character. When Bishop Laval came to Canada he determined to establish among the clergy of his diocese who were not members of Religious Orders, a community which would follow the lines of the Priests of the Seminary of Paris, in the founding of whom Laval had himself taken part. The Priests of the Seminary of Quebec were established as a diocesan religious congregation in 1663. The purpose of the society was to eventually work as missionaries among the aborigines. Naturally for many years the organization grew slowly in a strictly missionary country. Finally, in 1698, the group was able to release three of the priests to begin their work in a grand manner. At the moment the most attractive goal by way of primitive peoples were the Illinois about whom France and Canada had been hearing so much since the journals of Father Marquette had become available. This Nation of the Illinois had come to be pictured as the outstanding example of the "noble savage" whose conversion was hardly more than a question of the presence of a missionary. Thus when the Priests of the Seminary of Quebec planned to open up their grand venture into mission work, for which the society had been preparing for thirty-five years, one could well expect that they would petition for a place among the Illinois. It was their intention, as appears from the documents, to establish some central location where they could erect a European village out of which they could work

among the Illinois tribes and southward into what are now the states of Arkansas, Louisiana and Alabama as well as the whole of the Missouri River country.

After seeking advice from those who had visited the area, the Priests of the Seminary, at the suggestion of Henry Tonty, chose to locate at the village of the Tamaroa-Cahokia clan who occupied a plot of ground which was between two little streams emptying immediately into the Mississippi. Tonty had met these Indians and declared them to be friendly. The location, just opposite the present city of St. Louis, had also the excellent geographical advantage that it was not far from the confluence of the Mississippi and the Missouri rivers. Having received Letters Patent from the Bishop, St. Vallier, and a license from the Governor, Fontenac, three missionaries, Montigny, St. Cosme and Davion, left Quebec on July 16, 1698, with a group of hired workmen to assist in erecting mission buildings. Tonty also went with the party to introduce the missionaries to their new neophytes. The party reached Cahokia on December 8, 1698, where they visited the tribe briefly and continued southward to survey the field. By March, 1699, they had returned and Father St. Cosme was left at Cahokia to begin the town while the others went back to the Jesuit mission of the Guardian Angel to collect baggage stored there. By May 22, 1699, all had reassembled at Cahokia where the workmen had already erected a log chapel and a rude dwelling for the missionaries. With what splendor could be employed the missionaries erected a great cross, sang the *Vexilla Regis* and the *Te Deum* and entered on their labors.

For the first quarter century the little village had only the most tenuous hold on life. Father Bergier, the first priest who resided at Cahokia for any appreciable time, had no knowledge of the native tongue and found it very difficult to maintain interest in his efforts on the part of the Indians. On one occasion, only by merest chance did the Tamaroa-Cahokia not pack up and cross the river to the present site of St. Louis. Both the French crown and the Bishop of Quebec had promised funds to aid the mission, but in the long run neither source proved dependable, which obliged the priests to support the mission as best they might. Eventually, in 1724, the mission was granted four square leagues of ground as a sort of seignory from which it was expected that sufficient produce could be raised to support the work. It was within the province of the missionaries to sell their property, granting land in fee simple to buyers. By about 1735, Father Jean

Mercier, really the Father of Cahokia, a title merited by his thirty-six years of continuous residence at the place from 1718 to 1754, sent home a plan of the mission which shows a typical French village with dwellings of the inhabitants grouped around the church square and the fields divided into long, narrow strips of ground. The town could then boast about seven French families in residence. As for convenience, the mission had erected two mills and a blacksmith shop. The rectory was surrounded by an orchard and livestock was common. Already slaves had been introduced into the life of the village. The farmer-trappers were shipping out excess agricultural products, but Father Mercier complained that the French were none too stable a populace for they were given to leaving their village and roaming the woods. He thought that they were a bad influence on the Indians with whom they frequently inter-married though such action had been prohibited. Unfortunately, there are no parish records previous to 1783 which would enable us to gather much first hand evidence concerning the spiritual life of the village.

It becomes evident that at least by 1740 the settlement of Cahokia was definitely a replica of any little crossroads town in France. Already the crown had extended to the settlements of the Mississippi Valley the laws in vogue in the parishes of Paris. The area had been divided into provincial districts in which were officials who acted as notaries and judges to administer civil law. Internationally, meanwhile, the Valley and the villages therein were growing in importance to both France and England. By 1750, a race for dominance of the area was in progress between France and her rival, England. Conflict for control of colonies was inevitable and equally inevitable was the downfall of France. During this most trying period Cahokia suffered from Indian raids, the mustering of draftees for various campaigns and the consequent economic problems which are the correlative of war. The end result to Cahokia was the loss, in 1763, of her possession by France and the loss of her ecclesiastical shepherd, Father Francois Forget du Vergier, of the Priests of the Seminary of Quebec, who sold all property held in the name of his community and left in protest when the French banished the Jesuit missionaries from their colonial possessions in 1763. The autumn of 1763 was a dark day for Cahokia. Their pastor departed, they were subject to alien conquerors and their land was bereft. The only active priest in the whole upper Mississippi Valley was the Jesuit Father Sebastian Meurin, who tried to visit all the little French settlements frequently to bring the consolations of religion to a saddened people, many of whom fled to the newly established St. Louis to escape the domination of the odious English.

It is not an easy task to attempt to review Cahokia's history during her "critical period", 1763 to 1778. During that time there was constantly question both of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The English left the frontier posts such as Cahokia muddle along for many years before actually sending officials to care

for them. When those representatives of King George's government did come they were, all too often, anything but acceptable and frequently they were positively repellent because they were so politically corrupt and so disdainful of French law and customs. On the side of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, there was question of whether the Bishop of Quebec or the Spanish Bishop of Havana controlled the area. The scarcity of priests made for the lapse in the religious life of the people. Cahokia was outstanding in this respect for her citizens petitioned the Bishop of Quebec to send them a pastor whom they promised to support and for whom they declared they were willing to repair the parish buildings. They were given Father Pierre Gibault who came to the country in 1768 and labored zealously and unceasingly, though perhaps at times somewhat impetuously, the whole of his sacerdotal life. His actual incumbency as pastor of Cahokia was not long, but his influence on the French was prodigious. It is probable that his assurance that the American Cause was just and that under the principles for which the Americans stood the French could hope for peace was the greatest single factor responsible for the success of George Rogers Clark. Certainly when Captain Joseph Bowman marched into Cahokia to take the place for the Continental Congress of July 6, 1778, he was graciously received and the people of Cahokia showed every outward sign of rejoicing in overthrowing the yoke of England. They offered funds and men for the cause, building a fort in the town to help fend off English assaults on the back country.

It is rather astonishing how quickly the people of Cahokia assumed characteristics which we think of as typically American. The establishment of civil government and the acceptance of legal traditions stemming from our eastern seaboard states seem to have been accomplished in less than a decade. Of course it is true that Yankee traders poured into the far west once we had won the revolution. The Morrisons, the Gratz wholesalers of Philadelphia and such like merchants quickly spread through the country. Inter-marriage became common and with it the acceleration of the process of amalgamation. It may be said that by 1800, which is less than a quarter of a century after Cahokia became part of our country, the village had ceased to be French in its sympathies and looked to Americans for its future.

An event of purely parochial import occurred in 1799 when the parish dedicated its new and quite spacious church, built in the Canadian fashion of hewn logs standing perpendicularly. The event has received historical recognition due to the fact that the old building has survived in a surprisingly well preserved state and is being carefully restored in preparation for the anniversary celebration. Our national government deemed the building worthy to be nominated as one of our national shrines, contingent on the fulfillment of certain conditions. To indicate the significance of this step, it might be pointed out that the old church at Cahokia is considered to be in a category with the

(Please turn to page eighty-three)

Juan Donoso Cortés—Spanish Catholic Layman

Thomas P. Neill

Saint Louis University

A CENTURY AGO, on January 4, 1849, Juan Donoso Cortés spoke in the Spanish Cortes on the subject of "Dictatorship." The address was much discussed in the capitals of Europe, for in it Donoso Cortés direly predicted that from upheavals of the day there would inevitably result "the dark night of pagan Socialism." Donoso Cortés was himself much talked about in those days. His eloquent tongue and pen had placed him in the forefront of those condemning the revolution of 1848. When his book, *An Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism*, was translated into English, Orestes Brownson called it the "most eloquent book we ever read."¹ And he referred to its author in these words: "Among the noble and brave men who then [in 1848-1849] placed themselves on the side of religion and society, of faith and Christian civilization, and attempted to stay the advancing tide of infidelity and barbarism, few were more conspicuous, or did more to stir up men's minds and hearts to a sense of the danger, than the learned, earnest Donoso Cortés, Marquis of Valdegamas."²

Strangely enough, almost nothing has been written in English on this man.³ It is strange because he was acknowledged in his day to be a most penetrating critic both of the Liberal society in which he lived and of the Socialism then proposed as a cure for the evils of the mid-nineteenth century. His criticisms are pertinent today because the Liberalism and the Socialism against which he wrote are still alive—and for that reason he is quoted frequently as an authority in the Latin countries of Europe and America. Because his attacks on Liberalism and Socialism seemed so devastating, and were conducted on so high a level, Donoso Cortés was given a second life—and a somewhat altered meaning—in Hitler's Germany and Franco's Spain. Karl Schmitt revived Donoso because of the Spaniard's attack on the Liberal society and the parliamentary government which the Nazis likewise condemned. Donoso's arguments for stronger religious and political authority, his respect for the priest and the soldier, were good "raw material" for Schmitt to use in building his case for Nazism. In like

manner, and for like reasons, Donoso Cortés has enjoyed a revival in Franco's Spain. Unfortunately—as it almost always happens in the history of ideas—the revived Donoso Cortés is altered to suit the contingencies of this century.

This revival was almost inevitable. In the French edition of Donoso's works, Louis Veuillot observed: "The name of Donoso Cortés will not die; it will grow. His thought, far from falling into oblivion, will acquire greater influence in proportion as the symptoms which he foresaw manifest themselves."⁴ For a few decades after Donoso's death in 1853 it seemed that Louis Veuillot was wrong, because in those years the Liberalism⁵ which Donoso pictured as already suffering decomposition and putrefaction seemed healthier than ever. So Donoso's works of dire prophecy gathered dust in the libraries. But between the two world wars, when Liberalism crumbled and when authoritarian government put in its bid for position in Europe, Donoso was revived to plead their case against Liberalism and Socialism. Such revival, by the very reason of its occasion, does injustice to the man revived. Part of his thought is stressed, part of it is suppressed, all of it is twisted to fit the apologetic needs of Hitler's Germany or Franco's Spain—and never is it suggested that Donoso would have condemned them both, as indeed his complete writings implicitly do even today.

Donoso Cortés will be written about more and more in the next few decades. He will be invoked as a "prophet of our times," which he seems to describe as accurately as he does his own nineteenth century. It therefore seems proper that historians, who can achieve a certain measure of objectivity and who should have no other object than presenting the truth, should study this man's criticism of his age. Such study has a two-fold value: first, it enlarges one's knowledge of mid-nineteenth century European society in showing how it appeared to an acute Spanish observer; second, it is of value in itself, for Donoso's writings and speeches were influential enough in their day to merit study by the historian. They constitute a part of the history of the nineteenth century.

The purpose of this short study, therefore, is to introduce Donoso Cortés to English-speaking historians,

¹ "Church and State," *Catholic World*, V (April, 1867), 2.

² *Ibid.*, 1.

³ There is a good article by Alfonso de Cossio, "Donoso Cortés," in the Spring, 1947, *Dublin Review*. Two English translations of Donoso's *Ensayo sobre el Catolicismo, el Liberalismo y el Socialismo* contain brief biographical sketches of the author. These translations are entitled *Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (Translation by Rev. William M'Donald), Dublin, M. H. Gill and Son, 1888; *An Essay on Catholicism, Authority and Order*, translation by Mrs. Madeleine Vincent Goddard. (New York: Joseph F. Wagner "My Bookcase" Series, 1925).

Although I have not made an exhaustive search for articles in English on Donoso Cortés, I have come across nothing on him except for the several reviews on his book when it appeared in English translation.

⁴ *Oeuvres de Donoso Cortés*, translation by Louis Veuillot. (Paris: Librairie d'Auguste Vaton, 1858). I, vii. This three-volume edition contains all the later and more important items from the five-volume edition of Donoso's collected works. It also includes a number of letters not in the Spanish edition.

⁵ Liberalism is used in this article in the narrow and proper sense in which Donoso used it: as that body of thought associated with such men as Guizot in France, Mazzini in Italy, Quintana in Spain, Malthus and Ricardo in England. It is the Liberalism described by the Spaniard Don Sarda y Salvany in his book *El Liberalismo Es pecado*. It is not to be confused with the "liberalism" of a Democrat, or a Don Luigi Sturzo, or a Pope Pius XII today.

particularly to those who are interested in the history of the Church in the nineteenth century. This essay does not pretend to analyze or criticize Donoso's thought. It intends only to indicate the position he held in Spanish politics, in European intellectual affairs, within Church circles, and to suggest in what ways his thought can be profitably investigated in the future.

Juan Donoso Cortés was born during the Napoleonic invasion of Spain, on May 9, 1809. His early education, like that of most Spaniards in high position, was directed by a tutor. At the age of twelve he enrolled at the University of Salamanca to study law. A brilliant and precocious boy, he easily mastered his pre-legal and his legal studies; and he had time left over, while waiting to attain the minimum age for receiving his law degree, to develop an interest in history and literature. In these days Donoso attracted the attention of the aging Liberal, José Quintana. For several years he worked with Quintana, as disciple and friend, and from him he received the typical Liberal outlook of the time: a contempt for Spanish learning, an adulation for the French *philosophes* of the eighteenth century.

At the age of nineteen Donoso was recommended by Quintana to fill the new chair of literature in the College of Caceres. His inaugural lecture was a brilliant demonstration by the young man in which he showed wide erudition, though hardly profound knowledge. Even at this early age he exhibited remarkable oratorical ability⁶ and an eclectic attitude which enabled him, in time, to discard his rationalist heritage piece by piece as his thought matured in the years to come. Donoso is reported lecturing to his two students—some accounts allow him only one—as though they were two thousand. At any rate, from the age of nineteen he is a figure in Spanish and European intellectual affairs. A frequent contributor to various Spanish and French publications, a master of devastating logic and possessed of a gift for casting his thought in burning phrases, he is a man who could not be ignored by the thinkers or the politicians of his day.

In his sketch of Donoso's biography Louis Veuillot tells us that his friend's life "contains little in the way of events and is, in a way, only the history of his thoughts."⁷ Such a view of his life, however, is not entirely justified by the facts, and it does violence to Donoso's thought by wrenching it out of the social and political setting in which it was formulated. Donoso Cortés was a man of many parts—the eighteenth-century ideal—who was as much at home in politics or debates on a new form of taxation as he was in philosophical or literary studies. At the age of twenty-three he plunged into the turbulent water of Spanish politics with an essay on the succession question.⁸ This piece of writing so pleased Ferdinand VII that Donoso was given a place in the Spanish cabinet as Minister of Grace and Justice in 1832.

⁶ Donoso's speeches are still studied by Spanish-speaking students as the best models of oratory in modern times. Metternich is reported to have said of him that "he has no rival outside the orators of antiquity." [Cited by Alfonso de Cossio, "Donoso Cortés," *Dublin Review*, No. 440 (Spring, 1947), 34.]

⁷ *Oeuvres de Donoso Cortés* (Veuillot edition), I, vii.

From this time until his death in 1853 Donoso Cortés is a prominent figure in Spanish politics. Throughout the Carlist wars he remains loyal to Isabella's cause. He held a position in the government of Mendizabal, the reforming Liberal, and when the Liberals split into extreme and moderate groups Donoso joined the latter. He went into exile with Queen Christina when Espartero's regency was established in 1840. Serving as the Queen Mother's secretary and as Isabella's tutor, he mingled in Parisian intellectual society and read such authors as De Maistre and De Bonald. Donoso played a prominent part in reestablishing moderate rule in 1843 and in having Queen Isabella declared of age and therefore competent to rule. In the last ten years of his life he served as a prominent member of the Cortes, where his speeches were attentively listened to and avidly discussed by Parisians, Berliners and Romans, as well as by the Spanish. Meanwhile, Donoso served as ambassador to Berlin, where he watched the Berlin rioters intimidate Frederick William IV in the revolution of 1848. Later he was ambassador to Paris, where he watched the latter part of the revolution in France, where he saw Louis Napoleon's struggle against the legislature and his eventual triumph as Emperor Napoleon III.⁹

These events, from the Carlist wars in Spain to the near-victory of Liberals in Berlin and Socialists in Paris, influenced the formation of Donoso's thought. For through these years of combined political and intellectual activity Donoso Cortés gradually changed his doctrines until in the end this man who had begun his intellectual career as a Liberal was one of Liberalism's severest critics. That is why Donoso protested to the editor of the *Heraldo* that it was not just to quote his early writings in favor of Liberalism. "Between your doctrines, which I myself professed when I was still quite young," he wrote, "and those which I now profess there is a radical contradiction and an invincible repugnance."¹⁰

⁸ The succession question is an involved Spanish problem which served as the occasion of the Carlist wars. Ferdinand VII had no male children and he wished to have his daughter Isabella succeed him according to the ancient Castilian custom. The problem had been complicated by Philip V's introducing the Spanish Salic Law, debarring women from the succession, in 1713. In 1789 Charles IV had the Cortes abrogate Philip's decree—but the abrogation was not published until 1830. Ferdinand's brother, Don Carlos, refused to acknowledge the abrogation as binding on himself.

The clergy and the extreme Conservatives tended to back Don Carlos while the moderates and many of the Liberals backed Isabella. If Donoso's thought had in any way been "determined" by his political position, then he should have remained a Liberal all his life.

⁹ Donoso's letters from Paris through 1851 and 1852 reveal him as an acute political observer. He believed Napoleon's *coup d'état* of December, 1851, was "absolutely necessary" to save France from Socialism. He thought the crisis of the time showed Liberals incapable of ruling. Several months before the *coup* of 1852 making Napoleon an emperor, Donoso prophesied the event.

¹⁰ Donoso went on to explain this "radical contradiction" in these terms: "You believe that rationalism is the means for arriving at the reasonable; that liberalism in theory is the means of arriving at liberty in practice; that parliamentarianism is the means of creating good government; that discussion is to truth as the means are to the end; and finally, that kings are nothing else than the incarnation of human law."

"I believe, on the contrary, that human law does not exist, and that there is no law except divine law. In God is the law and the end."
(Please turn to page eighty-three)

The Forty-Eighters and the Election of 1860

Jasper W. Cross, Jr.

Saint Louis University

ONE of the seemingly unavoidable accompaniments of history has always been the accumulation of myths or unproved theories on a multitude of questions. These myths are seldom deliberately created and even less often the result of malice aforethought. Most of them have no importance, and the proving or disproving of them is largely a matter of academic interest. Quite possibly this brief study falls in that classification, since the election of 1860 is rather well settled by now and the returns are long since counted, filed and dust-covered.

However, the historian has long been confronted with rather bald statements that not only was Abraham Lincoln a minority president (a claim of debatable accuracy) but that he was elected by the foreign element, those who knew the least about the American political traditions and patterns.¹ More especially, the claim has been advanced that the German-American element, in particular, elected Lincoln by their overwhelming support for him in the Old Northwest in the 1860 campaign.² To this has generally been attached the corollary that this support for the Republican candidate came out of a deep-seated dislike of the institution of slavery.³

This contention is particularly to be found in the writings of a generation or two ago and notably in the works of German-American authors. This tendency on the part of national groups to lionize their forbears in this country is again not unprecedented, as can be verified by an examination of shelf-lists in any library; the author's ancestry and the national group about which he is writing seem to bear a noticeable coincidental relationship.

More recently, there has been a tendency to re-evaluate the work of the earlier scholars and writers in this field, as in all the scope of history. The newer scholars have generally been more cautious in arriving at conclusions and have been more inclined to go back of the broad generalizations and examine the motives and factors present in 1860.

It is not the intention of this paper to present any original findings but rather to give some correlated information based on the research of the specialists in this particular field of history and to arrive at some

conclusions relative to the position of the German-Americans in the election of 1860.

Any study of the political views of the "Forty-Eighters" in American history automatically suffers from certain difficulties. These obstacles to an accurate evaluation include the inavailability of complete information on the secret voting (and even more secret views) of all persons of German birth and descent, the tendency on the part of many writers to lump all Germans together without distinctions as to their being "Forty-Eighters" or earlier immigrants, and the normal national pride coloring the writing and use of information by the German-American writers who constitute the bulk of those who have discussed the topic. Despite these difficulties, an attempt will be made to present certain general conclusions.

Before broaching the topic of "Forty-Eighters," it is in order to mention the earlier German immigrants since they, too, have a political influence on the later period.

This group, usually known as the "Grauen," perhaps due to their age and presumably silvery locks, had come to the United States mainly in the early 1830's. Without attempting the difficult and perhaps impossible task of deciding whether these earlier immigrants differed from the "Forty-Eighters" fundamentally, it might be noted that their attitude during the crises of the 1850's was different.

Not too unnaturally, the German of the earlier vintage had come more and more to lose his identity and become like his neighbors of earlier American stock. That is to say, if he had settled in New England, he tended to become opposed to slavery; if he settled in the Middle West, he frequently became indifferent or divided in his opinions; while, if he settled (as some part of the German element did) in the Southern States, he usually adopted the views of the Cotton Kingdom. To put all this a little more simply, "the German element in this country had shown itself particularly susceptible to environmental pressure. It accepted, and adopted, conditions as it found them."⁴ However, they are usually considered (and rather correctly) as having been anti-slavery in their views. The correct portion of this contention lies not in the fact that the German people in America were universally anti-slavery by conviction as much as in the fact that most German settlers tended to be located in the Northern states, where most people were at least mildly anti-slavery.

Another factor which enters into the picture of German activity is the existence of the Nativist movement. This sentiment, best exemplified by the Native Ameri-

¹ E. g., William E. Dodd, "The Fight for the Northwest, 1860," *American Historical Review*, XVI (July, 1911), 774-788.

² Albert B. Faust, *The German Element in the United States* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909, 2 vols.), II, 137.

³ Julius Goebel, *Das Deutschtum in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika* (Munich, 1904), p. 59; Georg von Bosse, *Das deutsche Element in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Stuttgart, 1908), p. 255, quoted in Andreas Dorpalen, "The German Element and the Issues of the Civil War," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXIX (June, 1942), 55.

⁴ Dorpalen, *loc. cit.*, p. 55.

can ("Know-Nothing") party, might be said to have had a double effect on the Germans. One of these will be mentioned shortly. The first effect came to reinforce the natural tendency to conform as just indicated. As the "Know-Nothings," playing on the distrust of foreigners latent in most peoples, gained in strength in certain areas, the German element (and other foreigners as well) leaned over backward to show how well they actually could conform to the community norm in political and social thought.

Prior to 1850 most Germans had been Jacksonian Democrats, and it was into this party that most of the "Forty-Eighters" went first. For this, various explanations might be offered, with perhaps the very simple one of party name being as good as any. Democracy, to most German immigrants, sounded well. In addition, the make-up of the party—composed as it was in the North mainly of tradesmen and laborers—made the newly arrived German feel at home. With all this, the presence of more anti-foreigner bias in the Whig party (out of which most "Know-Nothings" were later to come) inclined more Germans to the Democratic party.

With 1854 and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill of that year, a change came over some of the German element. To most Germans the agitation over the organization of the new territory seemed painfully simple—the question involved was that of the extension of slavery, and this they opposed. All the other facets of the problem—state rights, sanctity of the Missouri Compromise, etc.—they regarded as extraneous and threw their weight against the bill.⁵ Von Holst declares that 80 of 88 German newspapers opposed it.⁶

Since the Kansas-Nebraska Bill had been the creation of Stephen A. Douglas and the Democrats and embodied their hope for a settlement of the slavery question, one might expect the German element to doubt the wisdom of its alliance with the party. This many Germans apparently did and in consequence the exodus began—but only began. It was not a wholesale desertion as will be shown soon.

Temporarily this migration from the Democratic party left many Germans at loose ends politically, with some joining the Whigs and a portion joining *Der Bund Freier Männer*, which had been organized in Louisville and had spread into many Mid-Western areas in 1853 and the following years.⁷

However, this part of German element was soon to find a place in the Republican party, newly organized in 1854. Apparently, the first Germans to lead the move into the new party were the "Forty-Eighters". This would seem logical since their allegiance to the Democratic party, being of shorter duration, was perhaps less firmly fixed.

The "Forty-Eighters" now attempted to lead their

fellow-countrymen into the Republican fold, but found difficulties in this operation. First of all, the German element of this country was divided into the "*Grauen*," or earlier immigrants, and the "*Grünen*," or later immigrants. The very fact that the "Forty-Eighters" ("*Grünen*") had become converts to the Republican faith was an obstacle to their rivals coming into the same party. Also, those of the "*Grauen*" who were Democrats had been so for some time and found the process of breaking party ties difficult and frequently impossible.

To these factors which complicated the process of drawing the whole German element into the Republican camp, should be added the presence within that party of elements that could not be wholeheartedly approved by most Germans of any vintage of immigration. Foremost of these factions was the "Know-Nothing" group, a large part of which had seceded earlier from the Whigs and which now entered the Republican ranks. Also present and prominent for a time in the early Republican councils were puritanical factions which ardently urged temperance and a rigid blue law observance on the new party. To these propositions, most beer-drinking and amusement-loving Germans were unwilling to accede. By the time of the 1856 election, however, the German element was moving toward the Republican camp, with this being far more inclusively true of the "Forty-Eighters" than of the earlier immigrants.

In the 1856 election, the "Forty-Eighters" were active throughout much of the Old Northwest. On the Republican electoral ticket in Illinois was Friedrich Hecker, formerly military chief of the Baden insurrection. Illinois also saw activity by Lieutenant Governor Gustav Koerner, while in Ohio F. Hassaurek and New York Friedrich Kapp appeared before the voters campaigning in behalf of the Republican candidates.⁸

However, the most active of the German element in the campaign was a young man, soon to be much better known, perhaps the best known of all the "Forty-Eighters". This was Carl Schurz, who campaigned actively in Wisconsin for what he termed "the old cause of human freedom . . . on the soil of the new world" and who was temporarily crushed when Fremont was defeated, wondering "was the democratic principle to collapse in America, too?"⁹

However, Schurz was soon to rebound from this despondency and to remain active in Republican political activity, unsuccessfully running for Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin in 1857 and refusing to run for the same office in 1859 (probably because of the failure of the "Know-Nothings" to support him in 1857 although they had successfully supported the rest of the Republican ticket). He also found time to speak for Lincoln in the Illinois senatorial race of 1858 and for the Republican party in Boston, stronghold of Nativism, in 1859.

⁵ Faust, *op. cit.*, II, 132.

⁶ Much of the material on the position of the German element prior to 1854 has been gleaned with much pruning and evaluation from Faust, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁷ Hermann von Holst, *The Constitutional and Political History of the United States* (Chicago: Callaghan and Co., 1885, 8 vols.), IV, 429n.

⁸ *Der Bund* seems to be a virtually overlooked organization. It is mentioned in Faust, *op. cit.*, II, 130, and elsewhere, but encyclopedias, dictionaries, and other source books fail to mention it.

⁹ Carl Schurz, *The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz* (New York: The McClure Co., 1907, 3 vols.), II, pp. 67-72. *The Reminiscences* indicate that Schurz felt he and his fellow Germans contributed no small amount to Lincoln's election in 1860.

(Please turn to page eighty-seven)

The "Prisoner of State" and Its Author

Benjamin J. Blied

Saint Francis Seminary, Milwaukee

It was still dark in Dubuque on Thursday morning, August 14, 1862, when Mr. Gregory made his way to Bluff Street and rapped impetuously at the entrance of Dennis A. Mahony's home. He had come to arrest Mahony, but since the latter enjoyed considerable local prestige Mr. Gregory took the precaution of concealing some husky henchmen in the neighborhood.

Less than a week earlier Edwin M. Stanton, secretary of war, had ordered the arrest of "any person or persons, who may be engaged by act, speech, or writing, in discouraging volunteer enlistments, or in any way giving aid and comfort to the enemy, or for any other disloyal practice against the United States."¹

Now that order had overtaken the editor of the Dubuque *Herald*. Mahony knew Marshal Hoxie as also his deputy P. H. Conger, and the former suavely assured his irate victim that he could confer with Governor Kirkwood. Although the chief executive was a political adversary of Mahony, the two were friends, and the editor placed confidence in the governor's statement that no one should be taken out of Iowa without a trial. But as the hours passed it dawned on Mahony that he was not being taken to the governor, so he dispatched a letter to him. The answer came—cold, formal, abusive. Small wonder, then, that he later wrote: "I never felt more disappointed and deceived in one whom I regarded as a friend, than I was in Governor Kirkwood. His treatment of me called to my mind all that I had ever read of a friendly confidence misplaced in a deceitful heart, and made me regret that he had ever called me friend, or done me a kindly act."²

However, on that eventful morning Mahony had no choice except to board the *S. S. Bill Henderson* under guard. Toward evening the steamer docked at Davenport and the prisoner of state was lodged in the Burton House. Next day a number of friends paid him a visit, and some kind ladies, noticing that he had been spirited off without being able to take anything along, provided him with laundry. Of course, Davenport had another element whose mouthpiece was the *Gazette*. Naturally this Abolitionist sheet, which had contributed to the arrest of Mahony, was duly jubilant.

On Saturday Mahony's involuntary journey continued downstream to Burlington. By Sunday morning the news of his arrival had spread far and wide with the result that Barrett House was crowded with friends of the manacled Democrat. The latter, not forgetting that the Lord's Day had dawned, asked to go to church. Permission was granted after due deliberation on condition that a guard occupy the same pew with him. As in Davenport, so in Burlington there

was an Abolitionist paper, the *Hawk Eye*, to gloat over the fate of the editor of the *Herald*. The *Argus* of Burlington, however, lost no time in carrying a long letter from Mahony. Challenging the widespread belief that secession had caused the war, Mahony denied that he had ever been or would ever be a secessionist. In his opinion the war "was caused by abolitionism, without whose existence there would have been no such heresy as secession."³

Meanwhile Hoxie had commandeered a locomotive to take him west to Fairfield to arrest Dana Sheward, editor of the *Constitution and Union*. The "outlaw" happened to be dining at the home of a friend, but he was soon aboard the locomotive which, partly due to the influence of whisky on the engineer, made a record run into Burlington.

Next Sheward and Mahony were placed on a train for Chicago and soon they were jogging over the mountains to Altoona, Harrisburg, Baltimore, and Washington. About noon on August 21 the editors were in the national capital, and by night they were under lock and key in the Old Capitol. According to Mahony, this American Bastille, an old brick building, had been erected in 1817 to accommodate the legislature after the capitol had burned. After the capitol had been repaired, the temporary building was converted into a boarding house which was patronized generally by members of congress.⁴

No sooner had Mahony explored the prison when he wrote a letter to Stilson Hutchins⁵ who was managing his paper in Dubuque. Besides expressing his consent to be a candidate in the third congressional district of Iowa, it also contained a denunciation of men who are traitors to the constitution and who plunder the treasury. Promptly the letter came back to its author annotated: "Nothing but family and business letters are allowed to pass."

But the doughty candidate succeeded in having someone smuggle out of the Old Capitol an address of acceptance which covers thirty-four octavo pages. Needless to say, it took considerable optimism to seek public office on the Democratic ticket. In 1859 Samuel Kirkwood had nosed out Augustus Dodge by the narrow margin of 56,505 to 53,542, but the following year Lincoln polled 70,000 votes to Douglas' 55,000. The president, duly grateful to Iowa's Republicans, ap-

³ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

⁵ Hutchins was born in New Hampshire in 1838. He came to Iowa in 1856 and went into the newspaper business. In 1860 he stumped for Douglas, and about that time he joined the *Herald* staff on which he served four years. He was one of the group that started the *St. Louis Times* in 1866. He also edited the *Washington Post* which likewise was a successful venture. In addition to his journalistic work he occasionally held political offices.

¹ Dennis A. Mahony, *The Prisoner of State* (New York, 1863), p. 111.

² *Ibid.*, p. 129.

pointed the self-made jurist, Samuel F. Miller,⁶ to the Supreme Court in July of 1862, and simultaneously Iowa was reapportioned. Formerly the state had only two representatives; thenceforward it would have six. In 1860 two Republicans filled the seats, and in 1862 all six republican candidates triumphed. Mahony's opponent was William B. Allison who inaugurated his long congressional career by capturing 3,660 more votes than "the prisoner of state."

Meanwhile Mahony was making appeals for liberation, and he whiled away some of his forced leisure by keeping a journal which he later made public. A committee of two doctors on one occasion testified that the prisoner's health was seriously waning, but that made no dent on the turnkeys. Ultimately, however, Mahony, Sheward, and several others were asked to swear that they did not belong to the Knights of the Golden Circle, and on November 11, 1862, the two Iowans were—in government parlance—"honorably discharged."⁷

Immediately the editor of the *Herald* compiled a book of 414 pages entitled *The Prisoner of State* which was published in New York by George W. Carleton. A vitriolic dedication to Stanton is followed by an introduction of a personal nature; then there is a denunciation of the assumption of arbitrary power over the army by the president, and then a review of the right of *Habeas Corpus* as expounded by Chief Justice Taney and other jurists.

After those hundred pages of background the author describes his arrest as well as that of Sheward and numerous others. Included in the opus is the lengthy campaign address and also his journal. The book ends with an appeal for peace as the means to secure union. Hope was held out for a companion volume to chronicle what had been omitted solely to keep the price of the book so low that it could enjoy a wide circulation among those who did not kowtow before the Republican regime.

Because the book is interesting, the reader becomes curious about the author's career.

Dennis Mahony was born in Ireland on January 20, 1821. At the age of nine he came with his parents to Philadelphia where he studied law under Charles J. Ingersoll. In 1843 he moved to the Territory of Iowa where he continued his law studies with the firm of Davis and Crawford of Dubuque. Simultaneously he served as professor for three years in St. Raphael's Seminary. Mahony next became principal of St. Patrick's Academy in Garryowen;⁸ in 1847 he was admitted to

the bar before the Supreme Court at Iowa City; and in 1848 he was elected to the Iowa legislature.

Neither the court room nor the class room interested him permanently. Accordingly when he was 28 years old he became editor of the *Miners' Express*⁹ of Dubuque. Journalism was more than a passing fancy because around 1851 he left the *Express* only to found the *Herald*. Although he did not own the latter he did control its policies.

In the hectic years preceding the Civil War Mahony remained a Democrat and an opponent of Abolitionism even though his views repeatedly placed his life and his press in jeopardy. During the war gossip abounded about secret organizations, and the Dubuque *Times* charged that the Knights of the Golden Circle had headquarters in the *Herald's* office. Since a number of secret societies, notably the Fenians, were attracting attention in Catholic circles, Bishop Smyth¹⁰ of Dubuque thought it his duty in 1863 to warn members of his flock against joining such organizations even if they professed to be purely political. At the outbreak of the war the bishop had publicly espoused the cause of the Union, and he took some interest in relief work; but it was after the assassination of Lincoln that he really became eloquent, with the result that someone set fire to his stable for spite.

There was probably considerable tension between Smyth and Mahony, but the editor also locked horns with Archbishop Hughes of New York on the subject of conscription. The latter as well as Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati had done much to induce the Irish and Catholic citizens, who traditionally were Democrats, to support the Lincoln administration, so it is no wonder that Hughes, annoyed by Mahony, sent him a reproving letter.

Incidentally, Bishop Loras who had died as recently as 1858 was inclined to favor the South because he had worked in Alabama from 1829 to the time of his consecration in 1837.¹¹ Consequently it was easier for Mahony to agree with him than with his successor who was familiar only with Ireland and Iowa.

During the months that Mahony was deprived of his freedom in 1862, Stilson Hutchins edited the *Herald*. After his liberation Mahony severed his connections with the paper. Hutchins hewed to the Mahony line and he elicited the same criticism which formerly had descended upon the head of Mahony.

After victory brought peace Hutchins, Mahony, and

⁶ He was the first judge to be appointed from the region west of the Mississippi. He held the position for twenty-eight years. Born in Kentucky in 1816 he became a physician in 1838, and in 1847 he was admitted to the bar. In 1850 he settled at Keokuk and took a lively interest in the organization of the Republican party.

⁷ Mahony, *op. cit.*, p. 404.

⁸ Despite the grandiose title it was only a one room parochial school which probably opened in 1842, two years after Father Mazzuchelli built a log church there. Originally the place was called Makokitti. After the community had become overwhelmingly Irish and Catholic its name was changed to Garryowen. Mahony played a prominent role in making the change.

⁹ The *Miners' Express* appeared from 1841 to 1854 when it merged with the *Herald*. The *Express and Herald* appeared until 1859. According to Mahony, *op. cit.*, p. 12, he became sole editor in May, 1860.

¹⁰ Smyth was born in Ireland in 1810, and in the 1840's came to Iowa. He was consecrated in 1857 and died in 1865. In 1862 he had gone to Rome where many of the American bishops attended the canonization of the twenty-six Japanese martyrs of 1597, and where they probably discussed what course to pursue concerning the war.

Smyth was one of the two Trappists who were members of the American hierarchy. The other member, J. M. M. O'Gorman, likewise came to Iowa from Ireland and was consecrated Vicar Apostolic of Nebraska in 1859.

¹¹ See M. M. Hoffman, "Clement Smyth Second Bishop of Iowa," *Iowa Catholic Historical Society*, February 1936, p. 13.

others launched the *St. Louis Times* in 1866, a daily dedicated to the interests of the Democratic party. After four years Mahony again ascended the Mississippi to Dubuque where he published the *Daily Telegraph* down to the time of his death on November 6, 1879. Interestingly enough, he was buried in the Catholic cemetery at Garryowen in the shadow of the academy over which he had once presided. Although he had been a friend of Bishop Loras, it is hard to say how fervent a Catholic he was when he became enmeshed in politics.

None the less his career on the American frontier in a time of storm and stress is curious enough to merit attention. If New York had its James McMaster, editor of the *Freedom's Journal* in jail, Dubuque was not far behind because it had a Dennis Mahony, also an editor, in the same unsalutary status.

Cahokia

(Continued from page seventy-six)

precious Independence Hall in Philadelphia. This evaluation of the building is quite correct when one recalls what the village of Cahokia means to the history of our west.

Cahokia's opportunity to develop into an important city in the heart of America was foredoomed by the very location chosen for it. After the American nation came into possession of the territory, the village could well have been the jumping off place for the Far West which opened up almost as soon as our Revolution was ended. It could have become the wealthy depot for the fur trade and a great port for the river trade. But, unfortunately for Cahokia, the little village stretched along the alluvial soil of the river bottom which was constantly in danger of floods. St. Louis, its neighbor, stood on a bluff, protected from the ravages of high water. Thus after 1800 Cahokia quickly declined in importance and slipped back into sleepy unimportance, a peaceful little agricultural center where life remained simple and the citizenry were happily satisfied with their lot.

Cahokia's civil history since approximately 1820 merits no detailed account. The history of the parish in the village merits some attention if only to recall for purposes of record that almost all of the great ecclesiastical names in the history of the Church in the middle west are to be found in the records of the parish. Father Gabriel Richard, Bishop Flaget, Bishop Du Bourg, Bishop Rosati and such great priests all at one time or another lent their services to the parish. The members of the Congregation of the Missions may be said to have kept Cahokia alive during most of the first half of the nineteenth century. The parish had the unique honor of being given for its pastor, in 1836, Father John Francis Regis Loisil, the first native citizen of St. Louis to be raised to the honors of the priesthood. Father Loisil was one of the first students of St. Louis University and was the product of the Seminary of St. Mary's of the Barrens, the institution begun by the Vincentians at Perryville, Missouri, to educate young men for the priesthood.

Not until 1912 did anyone give much attention to the antiquity of Cahokia. Father Robert Hynes, who became pastor of the parish in that year, reviewed the old parish records and determined to make the history of the place known as widely as possible. He took upon himself the task of saving the then one hundred and thirteen year old church which was about to be lost from sheer neglect. He carried on a campaign for funds which enabled him to protect the building, but not to restore it. His little pamphlet on the history of the parish really became the first source of information of any significance concerning Cahokia. Shortly after Father Hynes had aroused interest in the place, C. W. Alvord, profound scholar at the University of Illinois began to issue his sound reproductions of documents concerning the French in the Mississippi Valley. Soon historical associations began to take an interest and a veritable crusade on the part of these groups got under way to make Cahokia known.

Now Cahokia approaches her two hundred and fiftieth year with staunch interest in her history and a powerful movement to bring her forth as the excellent historical landmark which she is. It is difficult to say what Cahokia is by way of historical importance. She is more a symbol than anything. In her own right she was never really great. But she has survived, and enough of her history has been salvaged to give us a record of what the French meant to the Mississippi Valley. She is a kind of beacon to keep us reminded that European culture has been in the Valley almost as long as it was on our eastern seaboard. As such she deserves her celebration and may it be a grand one.

Bibliographical note:

Manuscript sources for the history of Cahokia are scattered from Quebec to New Orleans in America and in several depositories in France. Available printed sources are: C. W. Alvord (ed.), *Cahokia Records* and a forthcoming volume under the general editorship of J. F. McDermott, *Old Cahokia, a Narrative and Documents Illustrative of the First Century of Its History*. Secondary sources which will prove useful are: Joseph P. Donnelly, S. J., *The Parish of the Holy Family, Cahokia, Illinois, 1699-1949*, and J. H. Schlarman, *From Quebec to New Orleans*.

Juan Donoso Cortés

(Continued from page seventy-eight)

Donoso was himself of the opinion that this "repugnance" had developed as the result of his rather sudden "conversion" to Catholicism. He had been a typical "Latin Catholic" earlier in his life, one who had been baptized and who continued to believe that the Catholic Church was the true church, but who at the same time could hold opinions contrary to Catholic teaching and meanwhile not take the practice of his faith seriously. Two things, Donoso believed, saved him: "the delicate sentiment which I have always had of moral beauty, and a tenderness of heart which approaches weakness;

concentration of all rights; in man is obligation and the concentration of all duties . . . As for parliamentarianism, liberalism, and rationalism, I believe that the first is the negation of government, the second is the negation of liberty, and the third is the affirmation of folly." [Letter of April 15, 1852, to the editor of the *Heraldo*, in *Obras de Don Juan Donoso Cortés*, Collected and edited by Don Gavino Tejado. (Madrid: published by the editor, 1854-1855), V. 166-167.]

the first caused me to admire Catholicism, the second caused me to love it."¹¹ His visits to France had had a profound and salutary effect on his outlook. There he associated with some excellent Catholics whose virtuous lives, he became convinced, were due to something more than natural goodness. There, too, he read De Maistre, whose writings seemed convincingly to demolish the *philosophes* in whom he had formerly put his faith.¹² There, also, he saw suffering and revolution; he was appalled by its ugliness and by the misery it caused. "My conversion to good principles," he therefore wrote to Montalembert, "is due first of all to divine mercy and then to a profound study of revolutions."¹³ Witnessing his brother's death, however, seems to have been the event that finally pushed Donoso into the Catholic camp. And there he remained, one of the foremost lay apologists of the Church until his death, at the age of forty-four, on May 3, 1853.

A close examination of Donoso's writings and his speeches shows that his "conversion" away from Liberalism and toward the Catholic position was not at all sudden. He moved slowly but surely in that direction from his inaugural address as a nineteen-year-old professor until 1847, when he was fully "converted."¹⁴ His *Considerations on Diplomacy*, published in 1834, show him to have what Veuillot calls "not a Catholic mind, but a Catholic disposition."¹⁵ In this work Donoso shows an appreciation of the Church's role in history as a social institution. An article "Religion, Freedom, and Intelligence," published three years later, reveals in him an even deeper appreciation of the Church as an historical agent working out the harmonious development of man's liberty, his mind, and his religious faculty; and in this article Donoso writes a panegyric to the historical Christ as the only perfect man. By 1839 Donoso had definitely rejected Liberalism. From this time, whether he realized it or not, as Veuillot clearly shows, Donoso Cortés is a Catholic thinker. His ideas continue to mature for another eight years, it is true, but he no longer attempts to rescue certain elements of his Liberal age by combining them with the older tradition, as Montalembert and Ozanam and many of the so-called "Catholic Liberal School" try to do in France even after 1848.

Donoso's mature thought is to be found in his speeches, letters, and essays written after 1847, especially in his one book, *An Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism and*

Socialism.¹⁶ Three speeches are of particular importance for revealing Donoso's criticism of his age, as well as his own philosophy of history and his ideas on sociology and government: the speech on "Dictatorship," made on January 4, 1849; another on "The General Situation of Europe," given on January 30, 1850; and his last address to the Cortes, on "The Situation of Spain," delivered on December 30, 1850. A series of articles in 1847 on Pope Pius IX are noteworthy for showing his philosophy of history and his view of the papacy's role in Western civilization. In 1848 he published a series of articles on "The Church and Revolution," essays which mark the formal statement of his theories on revolution and the Church's role in history. Letters Donoso wrote to various journals and individuals while he was at Berlin through 1849 are useful both for autobiographical information and for an elucidation of his thought on particular points, such as his elaboration to Montalembert of the contract between rationalistic and Christian civilizations.

Donoso's ideas are nicely pulled together and systematically presented in his *Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism*. He had originally intended to write a three-volume work, but in the process of writing it he managed to reduce it to one.¹⁷ The work was published almost simultaneously, in 1851, in Madrid and Paris. It created a sensation, especially in France, where it was hailed by conservative Catholics as a masterpiece and condemned by the liberal groups as Manichean and fatalistic.¹⁸ The final statements of Donoso's thought are to be found in four long letters. Two of them were written to the editor of the Madrid *Heraldo* in April, 1852, in which he contrasts his views with those of the liberal Spanish journal. Another letter was written to the *Revue des deux mondes* to protest against beliefs attributed to him by Albert de Broglie. In this letter of November 15, 1852, which was never mailed to the *Revue*, Donoso further explains his views on parliamentary government, on the good and bad aspects of medieval society, on the Church's role in secular society. Most important of these four letters, however, is the one to Cardinal Fornari on "The Generating Principle of the Most Serious Errors of Our Day." This letter, written on June 19, 1852, is a

¹¹ Letter of July 21, 1849, to the Marques de Raffin, in Tejado, *op. cit.*, V, 110-111.

¹² The similarity between Donoso's thought and De Maistre's was frequently pointed out in Donoso's day. There can be little doubt that the Spaniard was influenced by the Savoyard's powerful arguments against the eighteenth-century philosophers and in favor of the papacy.

¹³ Letter of May 26, 1849, to Montalembert, in Tejado, III, 281.

¹⁴ Louis Veuillot makes an excellent study of the transition of Donoso's thought from Liberalism to Catholicism. [*Op. cit.*, I, i-xlv.]

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ These works are to be found, together with some material unpublished at the time of his death, in Tejado's five-volume collection of Donoso's speeches and writings. This collection contains all of Donoso's most important works, but there are minor items about which the editor was not aware when he published his work the year after Donoso's death. Some of these other writings are to be found in Louis Veuillot's three-volume edition, in French, of Donoso's most important works. The Veuillot edition quite properly omits all the earlier addresses and essays. There is a later and more complete edition in Spanish of Donoso's works which this author has not yet been able to obtain.

¹⁷ Letter of August 31, 1850, to Msgr. Gaume, in Veuillot, *op. cit.*, II, 195.

¹⁸ In a letter to "a friend," written from Paris on June 10, 1851, Donoso tells how all the conservative journals were enthusiastic about his work, how they ran long reviews and printed excerpts from it. He wrote that the only critical review was in the liberal *Journal de débats*. [Tejado, V, 145.]

There is an interesting history of the controversy the book stirred up in Catholic circles in Tejado, IV, 301-406. Donoso was vindicated by the publication of the Italian translation under the double authorization of the Holy See and the Archbishop of Foligno.

reiteration and an explanation of Donoso's criticism of his age and an analysis of what he considers the theological errors underlying the false political and social doctrines of the time. Essentially it is a restatement of the theme of his book on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism.

It must be remembered that Donoso Cortés is an orator of the "Romantic Age." He casts his thought in striking phrases, and, as almost always happens to the orator, Donoso's thought comes to be molded to some extent by the rhetoric in which it is conveyed to his listeners. Donoso's speech is full of overstatements, of superlatives not to be found in the work of a philosopher or a theologian. He paints in deep colors, sweeping his big brush of generalization across the face of Europe and through the course of history much as the Italian Renaissance artists painted their masterpieces. And as the Renaissance painter's work is a faithful reproduction of reality when viewed from the proper distance, though it seems a chaos of color on close inspection, so Donoso's full speech or article presents his arguments accurately, although single sentences cannot stand up under microscopic examination. His is not the kind of work to be examined phrase by phrase. It is the total effect with which he was concerned, and this is therefore what the critic must try to obtain. Thus, for example, he does not mean to deny the Liberals free will when he tells them that they are slaves, that true liberty is found only in saints. Or again, he does not mean that a deist cannot understand elementary mathematics when he claims: "He who has no notion of the providence of God is in the most complete ignorance of all things."¹⁹

Donoso protested when his writing was picked apart, when single phrases were wrenched out of context and used to prove that he was a fatalist, or that he deprecated human reason or overestimated the effects of original sin. He protested that he was writing against the Liberals, that his book was not intended for use in the seminaries, that he was a popular writer instead of a theologian. Many times he repeated the disclaimer made in a letter to Louis Veuillot: "I am profoundly ignorant of the science of theology, which I have never studied; I am not a scholar."²⁰ The *Civiltà cattolica*, like Veuillot, credited Donoso with a sound knowledge of theology, but it reminded its readers that he wrote in "the high and grand manner" for popular consumption rather than for theological students.²¹

¹⁹ *Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1888), p. 74.

²⁰ Letter of March 1, 1851, to Veuillot. In Veuillot, II, 207.

²¹ The *Civiltà's* article, in which the attacks on his work are stated and refuted, appeared on April 15, 1853. This article makes the point that Donoso writes popularly and that he directs his words to the Liberals and Socialists, "whose ideas on these matters are singularly obscure." "However," the article continues, "let us hasten to add that if the affirmations of the Marquis de Valdagamas appear daring and dangerous when considered separately and out of context, they are much less so in the body of the work, so that the peril of scandal and of error appears to us quite remote. It is true to say that we can only admire how a layman educated outside a seminary or the sacred confines of the cloister possesses so fully a knowledge of theology and penetrates so surely into the deepest mysteries and the most delicate questions." [Veuillot, III, 535-536.]

If the reader remembers that Donoso's writing is essentially polemical he will be in a position to judge it understandingly—and he can obtain a good picture of the society Donoso so roundly condemned. Although he is a polemicist, Donoso does not argue with the Liberals or debate with them. His method is decidedly not Socratic. Indeed, he believed that there was something devilish in argument and debate. "Discussion is the title under which Death travels when he seeks to avoid recognition and goes incognito."²² Again, he wrote that "polemics are dangerous and public discussion is vain. . . . I have rarely let myself be drawn into a discussion and never into a dispute."²³ Donoso simply states his case against the Liberals or the Socialists, ignoring all their counter-arguments and their protests. His method is deductive—and never quite fair, according to our notions of give-and-take debate—whereby he rigorously reduces his opponents' premises to their logical conclusions, whether they hold them or not. Such a method points up the contrast between Donoso's opponents and himself by minimizing what they hold in common. It serves, moreover, to set himself and his picture of Catholic civilization sharply apart from the nineteenth century in which he lived.

No more than a few of the main outlines of his thought can be presented here. At the basis of his sociological and political theory is the conviction that sound social thought depends on sound theology, of which it is both a part and a consequence. His age, he believed, was one in which the theological and philosophical errors of previous centuries had worked themselves out everywhere. "It [error] is in books, institutions and laws, in the journals and in discourses, in conversation, in the salon, the club, the home, and on the streetcorner, in whatever is said or done."²⁴ These errors, which are "infinite in number," reduce themselves to two: the denial of a providential God and the ignoring of original sin.²⁵ From these two basic heresies Donoso deduces the other mistaken beliefs of his day, errors subscribed to by Liberals and Socialists alike.

Donoso was convinced that his was a critical age. Europe was on the eve of the "greatest catastrophe of history. For the moment, what I see most clearly is the barbarization of Europe and before long its depopulation."²⁶ Donoso pointed out to those who thought him a millenarian that he was not announcing the end of the world. "I have simply said," he explained, "that things are bad. If they continue in this direction, we will end in a cataclysmic upheaval."²⁷ Tomorrow will be "a period of anguish; all the symptoms indicate it: blindness of the mind, animosity of spirit, arguments without object, battles without motive, but

²² *Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism*, 177.

²³ Letter of Nov. 15, 1852, to editor of *Revue des deux mondes*, in Tojado, V, 211.

²⁴ Letter of June 19, 1852, to Cardinal Fornari, in Tojado, V, 189.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Letter of August 24, 1849, to Msgr. Gaume, in Veuillot, II, 193.

²⁷ Letter of April 11, 1850, to Louis Veuillot, in Veuillot, II, 205.

above all—I will doubtlessly astonish many of the Assembly—the furor of economic reform.”²⁸

That is the key to the nature of the crisis. Liberals and Socialists alike had forgotten the purpose of life. They had combined to build another Tower of Babel. They agreed in asserting man's self-sufficiency, for both schools denied the effects of original sin on human reason and on man's will. They believed that man could live the good life without the help of grace, and they considered the good life a life of material pleasure. Donoso therefore condemned his age for the very reasons that his contemporaries exalted it. “It is an age of utilitarian systems, of great developments in commerce, of feverish activity in industry, an age characterized by the insolence of the rich and the impatience of the poor.”²⁹ It was an age which had overturned right order by giving first place to economic and social questions which were not of primary importance.

This social and economic upheaval had its counterpart in the political revolutions of his day. Donoso claimed that the Liberal governments of the early nineteenth century had resulted in anarchy because rulers did not know how to rule and citizens no longer knew how to obey. From this chaos would almost inevitably come dictatorship—either of the Socialist Party or of an individual like Napoleon III of France. “The way is prepared for a gigantic tyrant,” he told the Cortes, “colossal, universal, immense. Note it well. There is no longer any physical resistance: the steamships and railroads have demolished frontiers, and the telegraph has demolished distance. There is no longer any moral resistance: all spirits are divided, all patriotism is dead.”³⁰ The question for Donoso was no longer between dictatorship and liberty, for he thought liberty was dead. It was “a choice between dictatorship by insurrection and dictatorship by government.”³¹

Donoso explained why he had so pessimistic a picture of his age and of the future. His study of history, combined with his knowledge of human nature, made him conclude that man needed strong authority to guide his weak intellect and to restrain his corrupted will. This authority could be either interior or exterior, the moral authority of religion or the physical coercion of the state. In the past, he pointed out, whenever religious authority was weak physical authority became strong, and whenever religious restraints were strong physical power was limited. From this observation he deduced “a law of humanity, a law of history: they [the two kinds of sanctions] are of such a nature that when the religious thermometer rises the thermometer of repression falls, and, reciprocally, when the religious thermometer falls the political thermometer—political repression or tyranny—increases.”³² Because the society

of his age knew almost no religious sanction, it was becoming a society of tyrants and slaves. He therefore concluded that political repression would soon reach its apogee in dictatorship and tyranny.

This Spanish critic of Liberalism made the same mistake as Marx did in underestimating the toughness of the middle class. Like Marx, Donoso thought Liberalism dead. He believed that the revolutions of 1848 were the beginning of the end for the Liberal society, that within a short time Socialism would be everywhere triumphant. Like Marx, he looked upon Socialism as the inevitable result of Liberalism; but whereas Marx's “scientific” socialism developed from Liberal society according to the dialectical process, Donoso saw it as a direct, logical reduction of Liberal premises to their inevitable conclusions. He thought both systems were based upon a fundamentally false conception of human nature; both were essentially secularistic in that they pushed God and grace and sin out of society. They “differ not in ideas, but in daring.”³³ In many ways Donoso had greater respect for Socialists than he did for Liberals. The former he considered more logical, more honest, and more daring. Although they were frankly atheistic, still they were in some respects much closer to the Catholic position than the Liberals were.

Donoso was frankly pessimistic for the future because he did not think Europe ready to accept the only remedy which could cure its deep-seated malady. The cure, for him, was a return to right theological and moral principles, which meant, of course, a return not only to the Catholic Church but also to Catholic living. Economic reform, constitutional changes, new voting laws are futile remedies. The only cure lies in a change within men themselves. “Economic reforms are not a sufficient remedy for this evil,” he told the Cortes; “the fall of one government and its replacement by another is not a remedy. The fundamental error in this matter is to believe that the evils of Europe suffer come from governments. . . . The evil is much more profound, much graver. It is not in governments, but in the governed; the evil is that the governed have become ungovernable.”³⁴ In this respect Donoso Cortés differed fundamentally from such other Catholics as Montalembert and Ozanam. “I have never had any faith or confidence in the political action of these good Catholics,” he wrote to Msgr. Gaume. “All their efforts to reform society by means of public institutions . . . will be perpetually useless.”³⁵ For Donoso no compromise with his Liberal age was possible. The difference between Catholicism and Liberalism was a fundamental theological difference which could not be bridged over by compromise.

Basic to this Spaniard's thought was his theory of history. For him the cardinal events in history were the fall in the Garden of Eden, which explains the existence of evil in the world, and the mystery of the Redemption, which explains not only man's salvation

²⁸ Address of January 30, 1850, on “The General Situation of Europe,” in Tejado, III, 305-306.

²⁹ Letter to Cardinal Fornari, in Tejado, V, 194.

³⁰ Address of January 4, 1849, on “Dictatorship,” in Tejado, III, 270.

³¹ *Ibid.*, III, 274. It is interesting to notice Donoso's remarks on Russia in this speech. He believes that Russia may push into the political vacuum created by revolutions in Europe. Russia, he observes, is a country which engulfs and smothers any people around whom it throws its “protective” embrace.

³² *Ibid.*, III, 268.

³³ *Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism*, p. 258.

³⁴ Address on “The General Situation of Europe,” in Tejado, III, 314.

³⁵ Letter of August 24, 1849, to Msgr. Gaume, in Veuillot, II, 193-194.

but also all the good he has achieved on earth. Donoso looked upon history as the story of the struggle of good and evil, both within man and in society. This, to him, is the red thread of history. It is the story of man's natural inclination to evil and of God's saving him through the agency of grace. "There is my whole doctrine," he wrote: "the natural triumph of evil over good, and the supernatural triumph of God over evil. There is found the condemnation of all these systems of progress whereby modern philosophers, deceivers by profession, benumb the people, these children who will never emerge from their childhood."³⁶

Donoso Cortés was an independent thinker, as much an individualist in the field of speculation as his forebears had been on the field of battle. Like them, he was convinced of the rightness of his cause, even though he stood almost alone against the array of Liberals who were in his day in possession of the European mind. Donoso believed that time would prove him right. "I have faith in my ideas," he wrote to a friend, "but, as I have already said, my ideas will not triumph until after the Deluge which should come but has not yet arrived."³⁷ That is why he believed his book was one written out of due time, one which would become popular "after the Deluge." Although subsequent events have always been careless of men's prophecies, still they have treated Donoso Cortés more respectfully than they have his adversaries. In many respects he proved to be an accurate prophet of the tendencies inherent in the Liberal society. That is why he can still be profitably studied.

³⁶ Letter of July 16, 1849, to the *Heraldo*, in Veuillot, I, 366-367.

³⁷ Letter of June 10, 1851, to "a friend," in Tejado, V, 145.

The Forty-Eighters

(Continued from page eighty)

By the time of the Chicago convention of 1860, the German element was recognized as important enough to the Republican party to insure its being represented. Schurz was selected (over some Nativist opposition) as chairman of the Wisconsin delegation, while other delegates included Münch and Krekel of Missouri, Koerner and Schneider of Illinois, and Hassaurek of Ohio.

For the most part the German element favored William H. Seward for the nomination, perhaps because of his intellectual attainments and reputation, and perhaps on account of his known opposition to the "Know-Nothings."

While German support for the Republican party in the election of 1860 has been rather taken for granted and assumed to be on the basis of the dislike of slavery, too much may be presumed here. Actually, many Germans, even staunch Republicans, were not enthusiastic over the new party until certain objectives had been secured by them, and other Germans, even then, remained unconverted.

In the Middle West, the German element had certain definite demands to make of the major political parties. These, particularly, were the requests for adequate safeguards to political rights and personal liberties (aimed

at protection from the "Know-Nothings" who had already shown anti-foreigner bias in a virulent form in Massachusetts) and a homestead law of some sort to open the western public lands. These the German delegates were prepared to push, and they did present these so-called "Dutch planks" to the Chicago convention. The adoption of these German desires proved "the most effective argument the Republicans could have offered."¹⁰ "To them (the Germans) the platform had only two real planks, the thirteenth and fourteenth."¹¹

With the inclusion of the planks in the platform, the bulk of the 1848 element in the Old Northwest became Republican in 1860 and supported that party in the election. Schurz, for example, campaigned vigorously in the "doubtful" states of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, spoke in New York, Illinois, and St. Louis, and ended his activities in the German settlements in Wisconsin. However, while the '48er leaders threw themselves enthusiastically into the Lincoln campaign, the bulk of the German element did not. Numerous reasons contributed to this apathetic attitude, among which certain of the more prominent might be mentioned.

In the commercial and financial areas, notably in the East, but also to a great extent in St. Louis and Cincinnati, opposition to Lincoln was manifested on a basis of the long-held fear that the election of a candidate regarded as purely a Northern one would upset the highly lucrative trade with the Southern states. In line with this viewpoint, such a man as August Belmont, representative of the powerful Rothschild interests, supported Douglas as a compromise national candidate against the sectional candidates Lincoln and Breckinridge.¹²

This fear of disruption of the Union was not confined exclusively to the commercial interests, however, as numerous others unquestionably supported Bell or Douglas as non-sectional candidates without ulterior motives. This desire for Union and fear of disruption was undoubtedly strong in many Germans who recalled the plight of a divided Germany.

To these motives should be added the native conservatism of the German element and its loyalty to political and group contracts as earlier established. This tendency, while not so noticeably marked in the experiment-minded '48ers, was strongly evident in the older German groups.

Closely allied to this line of thought was that of the dominant religious groups—Lutheran and Catholic—in German-American communities. Already the abolitionist elements were under suspicion by these religious bodies because of the tendency on the part of certain of the abolitionist leaders, especially those of the Garrison school, to espouse radical ideas. While few of the abolitionists in the Republican party were of this radical fringe, suspicion of the whole movement still remained. Parenthetically, it might be noted that certain religious

¹⁰ Dorpalen, *loc. cit.*, p. 71.

¹¹ Donnal V. Smith, "Influence of the Foreign-Born in the Northwest in the Election of 1860," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XIX (September, 1932), 200.

¹² Dorpalen, *loc. cit.*, p. 65.

groups were frequently strongly abolitionist in the North, but these faiths were not those with any sizeable German membership. The '48ers, being generally of less fixed religious faith, were not influenced greatly by these religious attitudes, but the older Germans, being so influenced, became more difficult to lead along the political paths the '48ers marked out for them.

At the risk of overstress, an old influence—that of Nativism—must again be mentioned. Despite all the assurances in the 1860 platform of the Republican party and the verbal efforts of Schurz and others to reinforce the plank, the German voter still seems to have been wary of these "Know-Nothing" elements and to have regarded the Democratic party of Douglas as more trustworthy on this issue.

When an attempt is made to analyze the election figures themselves, difficulties immediately present themselves. Records of German population are incomplete and a breakdown of votes cast by different national elements for the candidates is, at best, fragmentary. Perhaps the best attempt was made by the late Joseph Schafer in his article, "Who Elected Lincoln?"¹³ In his research, Mr. Schafer worked particularly in Wisconsin, an Old Northwest state with a significant German population and one which has relatively accurate records of foreign population.

Mr. Schafer's method of study was that of taking as selected examples those counties having large German populations and those having few Germans or none, and of examining their 1860 voting records. From this analysis he reaches the rather startling conclusion that the German-dominated counties voted more heavily for Douglas and less heavily for Lincoln than most other areas of the state.

This trend, however, does not appear in the other states of the Northwest to such an extreme degree, but the reverse trend toward an overwhelming endorsement of Lincoln equally certainly does not appear, except perhaps in Illinois. Mr. Schafer is finally able to arrive at a flat conclusion that in the successful campaign of Lincoln for election the "foreign born contingents participated, but in no sense as determinative factors."¹⁴ In other words, the logical conclusion would appear to be that the German vote in the Old Northwest rather generally followed the general vote, state by state, of that year.

If we may accept the evidence presented by Mr. Schafer and by others, evidence which is admittedly incomplete and purporting only to show trends rather than exact statistics, we arrive at the conclusion that while the efforts of the '48ers to convert their fellow German-Americans into Republicans were strenuous, those efforts were only moderately crowned with success. They had, perhaps, served as the initial impetus which was to take most Germans into the Republican party in the post-Civil War era, but they had not accomplished the nearly-impossible feat of so doing in one election.

¹³ Joseph Schafer, "Who Elected Lincoln?" *American Historical Review*, XLVII (October, 1941), 51-63.

¹⁴ Schafer, *loc. cit.*, p. 63. Dorpalen, *loc. cit.*, p. 76, concludes that "the Germans did no more to assure Lincoln's victory than did their American-born neighbors".

Thus far we have examined almost exclusively the German element in the North. Although this portion of the German-American population was far more numerous, some attention should be paid to those Germans who settled south of the Mason-Dixon line.

This element was not numerous in most of the South since the economic system of the South was not such as to encourage many immigrants to settle there. The large scale plantation agriculture demanded more capital (and perhaps more experience) than most could muster, and the opportunities for trade and commerce or for skilled labor were not so appealing as those in the Northern states. However, in those areas where small-scale farming could be practiced profitably some German settlement did occur, notably in Texas.

In the majority of the South, the German element tended to conform to accepted political and social ideas of their section even when this might mean breaking with Germans in other sections of the country, as, for example, the Charleston Turnverein broke from the National Turners' Alliance when the latter condemned slavery.¹⁵

To try to summarize this German attitude in the Old South is not entirely simple, but certain statements may be made with reasonable assurance.

Generally, the Germans, whether in the North or South, did not favor slavery, perhaps because of ideological reasons, perhaps because of a lack of actual personal possession of slaves. Numerous statements to this effect may be found for both areas.

However, the German held no love for the Negro and little apparent interest in seeing him free, perhaps because of racial superiority feelings, perhaps because of long-time residence in the South and absorption of its viewpoints, perhaps because of a fear of economic competition from free Negro labor. This last point does not seem to have been so prominent among the Germans, however, as among the Southern Irish.

On the question of secession there is a distinct cleavage between the old immigrants and the "Forty-Eighters," with the older element tending to identify itself with its long-time friends and neighbors in the belief in Northern oppression of the South, the hatred of "black Republicans", the fear of the consequences of the election of Lincoln, and, consequently, a rather general approval of secession as being necessary. Most, nevertheless, were anxious to remain in the Union so long as it could be compatible with "honor."

The "Forty-Eighters", on the contrary, having absorbed less of the Southern viewpoint in their shorter residence, perhaps feeling more loyalty to the national government which had so recently admitted them, and also having been generally nationalists (rather than sectionalists) in the mother country, tended to disapprove of secession. While this element generally did not escape Confederate service during the war, it accepted it reluctantly.

We might briefly examine one of the Southern states

¹⁵ Ella Lonn, *Foreigners in the Confederacy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1940), p. 34. Miss Lonn's volume is easily the outstanding volume on this topic.

—Texas—where there is enough German element to warrant a discussion.¹⁶ In Texas, where the German element represented between three and four per cent of the population in 1860 (highest in the South and among the highest in the United States), an antagonism to slavery in principle seems to have manifested itself in the 1850s. In 1853, these settlers formed a political society known as *Der Freie Verein*, similar in its opposition to slavery to the aforementioned *Bund Freier Männer* and possibly allied with it. In 1854, this organization, with others, sponsored a state-wide convention in San Antonio with the idea of uniting the German element—not as a party but for linguistic reasons. The platform drawn up, however, denounced the existence of and urged the removal of slavery, but considered this to be a matter for the states to decide individually as it was wholly a state matter.

When, however, a storm of protest (partially Nativist-inspired) broke over the resolution, many conservative Germans throughout the state rushed to disavow the action of the convention as being unrepresentative. These disavowals frequently pointed out a fact alluded to before—that the Germans of the South had an identity of interests with the slaveholders. In less publicized statements, Germans indicated that their disavowal of the convention was based partially on a fear of "Know-Nothing" reprisals against the Germans as a distinct body.

On the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, most Germans in Texas seem to have been in vigorous opposition, holding to the Davis-Calhoun theory that all territory was open to slaveholders. (Note, that while Germans in North and South alike disapproved of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, their reasons for disapproval were diametrically opposite.) In line with this same point of view, Southern Germans warmly approved the Dred Scott decision.

When the 1860 election came, the voting of the German communities again followed the state-wide pattern. That is, in virtually all areas, the overwhelming majority of votes cast were for John C. Breckinridge and the Southern Democratic party. The only even nominal competition came from John Bell and the Constitutional Union party, with neither Douglas nor Lincoln receiving any portion of the votes worth mentioning.

Following the election, the German element agreed with the majority of Texans that Lincoln's election endangered the institutions of the South. In one of the two heavily German counties the ultimate remedy proposed, if the North did not adequately guarantee the South's rights, was that of re-establishing Texan independence. In the other areas, the proposal was to call a slave-state convention, in an attempt to stay in the Union with honor, and, should this prove impossible, to secede as a last resort.

In the vote on the ordinance of secession, the German element was found in the opposition column. Much

has been made of this as indicating anti-slavery sentiment which would seem erroneous. In view of what has been shown, it is apparent that the German-Americans were voting for Union, rather than against slavery.

In Texas, then, and in the South generally, the influence of the '48ers seems to be negligible. This is not difficult to understand in view of their very small numbers and in view of the relatively more solidified political views of the South. No new party development, no condition of flux in political lineups was present there as in the North, where the '48ers found some fertile ground in the somewhat disorganized condition of the political parties in 1860.

From the foregoing, certain generalizations may be fairly drawn. First, the '48ers themselves became rather early converts to the Republican cause, apparently to no small degree because of its stand on the slavery question. Second, this group made strenuous efforts to create solid German support for the Fremont ticket in 1856 and even greater efforts in behalf of Lincoln in 1860. Third, these efforts were not without success and did swing many German votes into the Republican column. Fourth, this German swing was not unique or unshared by similar shifts among other groups nor was the German support in 1860 the decisive factor of the election.

Communications

To the Editor, THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN:

WHEN a reviewer believes it necessary to charge an author with a lack of "at least" a "pretense" of impartiality, with an inability "to divorce himself from his preconceptions" and with being "self-contradictory", it is incumbent upon that reviewer to demonstrate his competence to use ordinary logic and to distinguish between what the author wrote and what he paraphrased from some other person. It is also incumbent upon the reviewer to use a "method . . . in the presentation of his thesis" that will not arouse the suspicion "at least" that he is ignorant of the material about which he writes, that he is himself partial, or that he has even misrepresented the positions taken by the author. In his review of my *Austria from Hapsburg to Hitler* (THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, Jan. 1949, pp. 42-43), Mr. Anthony J. Czajkowski, to use his own words, "falls far short" of achieving the elementary standards of competence and objectivity just stated.

Mr. Czajkowski "proves" that I was "not concerned with any . . . pretense" of impartiality by quoting my statement that my conclusions and judgments "sum up to a bill of indictment." His conclusion is a *non sequitur*. It is as preposterous as it would be to "prove" that President Truman, Cardinal Spellman and the Holy Father himself were "not concerned with any . . . pretense" of impartiality by pointing out the undeniable fact that their recent statements on the case of Cardinal

¹⁶ Texas' German population and its attitudes are well discussed in Rudolph L. Biese, *The History of the German Settlements in Texas, 1831-1861* (Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co., 1930), pp. 195-207.

Mindszenty "sum up to a bill of indictment" against the Communists.

The reviewer "proves" my inconsistency by noting my criticism of Schuschnigg for not effecting a coalition with the Socialists and pointing out that elsewhere I wrote that previously the Socialists had rejected a coalition. The logic of this "proof" is about on a par with the statement that the foreign policy of the United States is inconsistent because during the later years of World War II we sent arms to Russia and now refuse to do so.

Mr. Czajkowski's allegation that my "... chief reliance was upon Social Democratic sources and upon newspapers and magazine items which support (my) contentions" arouses the suspicion that he is astonishingly ignorant of the nature of the material cited by me, or has failed to read large sections of my book, or had the deliberate intent to distort the facts and mislead his readers. There are literally hundreds of citations to official documents issued by a government which the Catholic party absolutely dominated, to Catholic and other anti-Socialist newspapers, books, pamphlets, and so on. The reviewer's apparent intent was to indicate that my "indictment" rested "chiefly" on biased sources. The fact is that the greater part of my evidence against Seipel, Dollfuss, Starhemberg and Schuschnigg, particularly the most damning items in it, came from their own signed writings or from quotations of their speeches in official documents or the Catholic daily of Vienna, the *Reichspost*.

One of the most illuminating illustrations of the reviewer's "method" is his presentation of my position on the "inevitability" of the conquest of Austria by Hitler. According to him I wrote that this could have been prevented if Schuschnigg had followed a two-fold policy of coalition with the Socialists and solicitation of the help of democratic countries, especially England and France. The first sentence of my chapter XXXI (p. 1623) is: "The annexation of Austria by Germany was inevitable after Hitler's accession to power on January 30, 1933, unless the victors of 1918 had been willing to stop him, by arms if necessary." On the last page but one (1857) I wrote: "I agree that international appeasement finally settled the fate of Austria." Several other passages (see particularly pp. 1625, 1760, and 1796) contain the same idea. In short, I stated three conditions, not two. The precise nature of my criticisms of Schuschnigg's foreign policy is stated in my book; it is too long to repeat here. To paraphrase Mr. Czajkowski, "the suspicion is warranted" that he failed to read whole sections of my book, or read them with inexcusable carelessness, or deliberately misrepresented my position.

Another illuminating illustration of the reviewer's "method" and "competence" appears in his fifth paragraph in which he charges me with being "self-contradictory." He correctly states that I condemned Dollfuss and Schuschnigg for not drawing closer to France and England and continues, "but in commenting on Schuschnigg's policy after the fateful visit to Hitler he [Gulick] writes (p. 1804): 'For three days after Berchtesgaden Schuschnigg had sought advice. Not even the faintest word of encouragement or support reached him from London or Paris.'"

In the first place, I did not "write" the sentences quoted. They are a close paraphrase of a statement by Deputy Ybarnegaray in the French Chamber. If Mr. Czajkowski actually read the preceding 1803 pages, he knows that I frequently used long paraphrases. Moreover, there are veritable signboards above and below the sentences quoted to show that they are a paraphrase. (Incidentally, I might have been picked up for the proof-reading error that left Ybarnegaray a "Socialist.")

In the second place, the reviewer set out to prove that "In the matter of Austria's foreign orientation, Gulick is self-contradictory." He cannot do that by citing an appeal to the western democracies *four weeks* before Hitler marched into Austria. For more than *four years*; that is, since Dollfuss sold his country into vassalage to Mussolini at Riccione in August of 1933, the orientation had been almost exclusively toward non-democratic countries. That period includes Schuschnigg's insulting snub to France and England just before he signed the July 11, 1936, "agreement" with Hitler.

Finally, with reference to Mr. Czajkowski's statement that I wrote more as "a prosecutor than an impartial judge", I remind him that this would not have been necessary if numerous Catholic political writers, acting at one and the same time as prosecutors of the democratic institutions of the first Austrian republic and defense attorneys for the indigenous Austrian brand of Fascism, had not deliberately obscured or even falsified historical facts. Their purpose was to deny, or "at least" to minimize, the responsibility of Seipel, Starhemberg, Dollfuss and Schuschnigg for replacing democracy with Fascism in Austria. Unlike them, I am opposed to totalitarianism—whether it be imposed in the name of the Communist Manifesto or of *Quadragesimo Anno*.

CHARLES A. GULICK.

To the Editor, THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN:

I wish to thank you for your offer of space to reply to Mr. Gulick's reactions concerning my review of his two-volume work in the January issue. Since there seems to be a basic difference of opinion between the author and myself as to what constitutes historical writing, I do not believe that any useful purpose can be gained from a detailed controversy over the merits or demerits of the book. The two volumes are now before the public, as is my review and Mr. Gulick's reply. The two volumes must speak for themselves and I prefer to allow the readers to form their own judgments concerning the points raised by Mr. Gulick and myself.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Book Reviews

Saint Elizabeth, by Anne Seesholtz. New York. Philosophical Library. 1948. pp. 136. \$2.75

Miss Seesholtz's handling of St. Elizabeth, while sympathetic, fails at understanding the spiritual element both of Elizabeth and of the Middle Ages. Tolerance of an age, a creed, and admiration for a charitable woman, though praiseworthy, are not enough when one undertakes to tell the world about a saint. Criticism of some legends concerning St. Elizabeth seems, on the whole, more objective than that exhibited by previous biographers; the reason perhaps, is that Miss Seesholtz does not permit interest in her subject to lull her into absolute acceptance of all medieval hearsay.

Although it contains a useful index, the book lacks other elements of scholarly technique: bibliography and documentation—save for the too numerous quotations from modern books. In fact, this distracting frequency of quotation joins with the historically precise enumeration of Elizabeth's family and family appendages to disturb the continuity of the narrative. Inclusion of the many ballads and much of St. Francis's writing seems to be overdone.

Added to the unnecessary explanation of medieval customs and the lack of documentation, the inclusion of so much German operatic legend and balladry indicate that the book was written for the non-professional who is interested in history and culture. In spite of these colorful additions the work sometimes sounds like a seminar paper rather than a biography and appears often to be an attempt at refuting many popular beliefs about Elizabeth. Scattered opinions, seemingly contradictory, are presented throughout; in no place does the author attempt to synthesize or philosophize. In the over-all view, the picturization of Elizabeth is sincerely drawn, and is accurate as far as it goes; however, it lacks the balance of spiritual interpretation.

BETTY PATRICIA GRAHAM.

Maryville College.

The Renaissance in Historical Thought, by Wallace K. Ferguson. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Company. 1948. pp. xiii, 429. \$5.00

"The Renaissance" is one of those terms about which historians have written ever since the fifteenth century. To each historian, it seems, it has had a slightly different meaning. Some have looked upon it as a cultural movement, some as an age of transition; others consider it the end result of the Middle Ages, and still others consider it the true beginning of modern times.

Professor Ferguson, a recognized specialist on the Renaissance, has done an excellent piece of work in writing a history of the histories on the Renaissance. The first two chapters show what the men of that age thought about themselves and their "Renaissance." From there the author works into the rationalist tra-

dition of the eighteenth century, the romantic reaction of the early nineteenth century, down to the formation of the still generally held Burckhardtian view that the Renaissance was an epoch in the history of civilization. He concludes with an examination of the reaction of the medievalists to the Burckhardtian view.

Each of these interpretations of the Renaissance, Ferguson concludes, added something to our knowledge of the subject, but none of them is the whole historical truth. The author therefore concludes that the time is "ripe for a new and more comprehensive synthesis." He does not attempt to offer such a synthesis, but certainly his work is a necessary preliminary to any intelligent new synthesis of the Renaissance. In its own right, it is a good survey and a good analysis of what men have said about the Renaissance these last 500 years. It will become a "must" for any teacher and any graduate student of this subject—unless he is prepared to do this task himself.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

The World in the Twentieth Century, by Geoffrey Bruun. Boston. D. C. Heath and Company. 1948. pp. xxiv, 799. \$5.50

To stop the study of history at the beginning of our century is to fail to take the last step in the long journey through time—a failure that in many ways nullifies much of the profit gained from the study of earlier periods. Yet this is too frequently done. It is truly objected that events so proximate and oftentimes still unfolding are too difficult, if not impossible, to grasp and to explain. Still, it is not less true that the most proximate events often have the greatest impact on the present. For this latter reason the student of history must be at least introduced to recent history, and the historian must attempt to record and interpret it. Textbooks devoted to the recording of twentieth century events are not rare, but Professor Geoffrey Bruun has completed one of the very few which attempts an interpretation of the period.

While great parts of this work are little different from the customary text on contemporary history, there are chapters that are noteworthy. The chapter entitled "The End of an Era" is a brief but excellent epitome of the main currents of the nineteenth century which anyone acquainted with the period might read with profit. The whole section covering the states of Europe between 1900 and 1914 is handled in a novel fashion. Assuming that all contemporary states are faced with three commanding problems, viz., the problem of resources, the problem of defense, and the problem of social justice, the author treats each state individually in the light of these problems and concludes that the mode in which the state meets them determines its history.

However, the greatest aid Professor Bruun offers to

the student of the present era is to be found in the final section on Western Culture, four chapters entitled respectively: "Science and Technology"; "Architecture, Art, and Music"; "Literature"; "Philosophy and Religion". In this section an attempt is made to explain and relate such events as the revolution in physical science due to Einstein's theory of relativity, the mechanization of modern life, the disintegration of bourgeois social values, and the intellectual "revolt against reason" in favor of pragmatism and the subsequent reflection of all this in the arts.

There are, no doubt, those who will criticize the work for its emphasis on the economic and geographic factors as determinants of modern history. Although the author answers that these are among the few factors in a fluid period that are constant, certain and capable of defying the most vehement ideologies, the approach remains deterministic and impersonal. Others can and will object that many of the interpretations are premature and, therefore, unsound. The author is the first to admit that "truth is the daughter of time" and that his is but "a provisional analysis, a temporary verdict."

Since the book is largely an analysis, or verdict, and not primarily a factual account, the student being introduced to the period would possibly find other more factual accounts of greater help. It is rather recommended as supplementary reading or as an aid to the teacher in understanding some of the complexities of our century. Its great value lies in the author's endeavor to indicate the significant theme of the plot in a drama still playing on a global stage.

DANIEL J. REED.

The Origins of Modern Constitutionalism, by Francis D. Wormuth. New York. Harper Brothers. 1949. pp. 243. \$3.00

This is a difficult book to read, and a difficult book to review. Its main purpose seems to be a description of the origin and development in political science of the various devices and ideals usually associated with "constitutional" government. The accepted meaning of this term is that which regards a "constitution" as a contrivance which not only describes but *confines* government, at least in its everyday activities. The arrangements for thus limiting government, and for protecting one or another section or interest from governmental encroachment, are agreed to be of two kinds. First are institutional devices, such as checks and balances, separation of powers, bicameralism and judicial review. Second are the ideas or ideals, particularly as to the nature of law. To the constitutionalist, law is a rule of conduct; therefore it must be in general terms, and it must be prospective. Its most essential element is judgment rather than will, and thus the fundamental nature of law must always operate to limit even the lawmaking power.

The author in this case proceeds to illustrate the development, in ancient political thought, of certain of these institutions and ideals. However, his treatment of the ancient world is sketchy and somewhat

disjointed, and offers considerably less in the way of both information and analysis than other standard works such as McIlwain's *Growth of Political Thought in the West*. The entire early period of the Christian era is glossed over in a few pages, the implication being that these ten centuries offered no contribution to the development of constitutionalism. The main interest seems to be the English Civil Wars; in any event, it is the institutional and ideological developments of that period which receive the greatest attention. So much detail and documentation is offered that the reader emerges more confused than enlightened. Names and dates are offered with an abundance of profusion. By way of example, it did not seem to this reviewer to matter very much whether the seven sets of initials attached to a 1659 pamphlet on "The Army's Duty" be correctly identified or not; at least not in so far as the contribution of the pamphlet to the development of constitutionalism is concerned.

The conclusion arrived at by the author, after his search into the origin and growth of modern constitutionalism, is rather disconcerting: "The truth is that there is no solution to the problem of constitutionalism. Wherever the power of final decision is lodged, there is also the power of abuse." If this is the truth, might it not be more purposive to undertake as a basic field of study, not the origin and development of such deluding devices as written constitutions, separation of powers and bicameralism, but rather an exposé of the utter inadequacy of such arrangements and ideas, and a frank recognition that every government must be arbitrary? At least, this was the reaction of the reviewer in this case; and as the lawyer would put it: "Further than this, deponent sayeth not."

PAUL G. STEINBICKER.

Kaskaskia Under the French Regime, by Natalia M. Belting. Urbana, Illinois. University of Illinois Press. 1948. pp. 140. \$1.50 paper, \$2.50 cloth

The title of this monograph is misleading. The author would have given a better description of her effort if she had called the work a collection of essays on the village life of Kaskaskia, for this is what she has written. There is a great deal of good research evidenced in her essays and also some rather amusing mistakes. The introductory chapter should have been a clear narrative of the foundation and subsequent history of Kaskaskia. Instead, the author wandered off into several interesting, but distracting, bypaths which leaves her reader confused and discontented. The other chapters are excellent examples of how much information a really close student of history can dig up from a minimum of documents and with a maximum of hard work. The chapters on the life of the village, occupations of the people, their social intercourse and the like, are both fine research and fine writing. But with all her fine work, this reviewer does not think that the author understands the French of Kaskaskia. She has made the common error of so many who have written about the colonial French. One would imagine that they were always gay, carefree, given to dancing all

ht and gamboling across the village square all day. The French were a simple, rugged people, quite earnest and very well aware of life's hardships. They were religious and devout, even when they were not obeying God's laws. Miss Belting missed the character of the people. She also made some odd mistakes about religious customs. A church bell would not be recorded being baptized. Midnight Mass is not celebrated on any Saturday. Likewise, Midnight Mass is on Christmas.

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY.

The Development of Southern Sectionalism, 1819-1848, by Charles E. Sydnor. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: State University Press. 1948. pp. xii, 400. \$6.00. This is volume five of the projected ten-volume "History of the South," edited by Wendell H. Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter and published by Louisiana State University and the Littlefield Fund for Southern History of the University of Texas. However, only one other volume—"The South During Reconstruction," by E. Merton Coulter—has appeared prior to this.

The general plan of this volume divides it generally into the development of two lines—internal changes within the South during the period under discussion and changes in the relationship of the South with the national government.

The first of these two divisions deals largely with economic and social development within the area under discussion and, while it is essential to a thorough understanding of the Southern point of view, it will have a greater appeal to the student of Southern history than to the general historian. Despite the author's apology for his shortcomings, they do not weaken his treatment of these developments.

The second division will be of wider interest to most historians, dealing as it does with the problem of the position of the South in the nation; its recession from a majority position to that of a minority in national affairs, and its reaction to that decline in importance. The author attempts neither a defense for nor an attack upon the Southern viewpoint but adopts the far more useful course of endeavoring to explain why and how Southern minority strategy evolved.

Dr. Sydnor, Professor of History at Duke University, is another of the distinguished Southern historians selected to produce the volumes of this series. He has accomplished the difficult feat of welding regional history and federal relations into an interesting and usable whole. The entire series, barring an unlikely decline in its quality, seems certain to be an indispensable set of Southern history.

JASPER W. CROSS, JR.

Footprints on the Frontier, A History of the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Concordia, Kansas, by Sister M. Evangeline Thomas. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press. 1948. pp. xiv, 400. \$5.00.

The Sisters of St. Joseph were founded by Father Paul Medaille, S. J., in that fertile soil of religious

congregations, Le Puy in southern France, in 1650. Four little missionary groups of these have come at various times to various sections of the United States. The first to come, which may well be named the Fontbonne Sisters, came to Carondelet in St. Louis County, now in St. Louis, in 1836.

At present (1948) the Sisters of St. Joseph number 15,494 in the United States. They are conducting 14 colleges, 232 high schools, 875 parochial schools, 61 hospitals, 25 nurses' training schools, 30 orphanages, 10 homes for the aged, 3 sanatoria, and 12 foreign missions. Except for less than a thousand sisters, every member of this now powerful organization belongs ancestrally to the Carondelet community.

One of the earliest colonies from this Missouri parent home migrated to what is now the Diocese of Rochester; and the first novice that was admitted to this New York community, Margaret Leary, later to be known as Mother Stanislaus, a truly valiant woman, and her two sisters, Sisters also of St. Joseph, were destined to plant, in 1883, the first "footprints" of this congregation "on the frontier".

The volume before us tells, first, briefly, in the eloquent oratory of Bishop Thill of the "sacrificial devotion" with which, from their mother-house in Concordia, these Sisters have blessed the land; then with a wide sweep of historical perspective, Sister Evangeline details the story of the origin and achievements of the congregation.

The origin may be found in the inspired instruction of Father Medaille, given to his first sister-disciples entrancingly calling upon them to live the humble life of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, a flame of the Holy Spirit that to this day visibly lights up the lives and the works of these Sisters of St. Joseph.

The character, and an example of their achievements are made manifest in their Marymount College in Salina, Kansas—a school both architecturally and culturally magnificent "the largest of its kind in the country" at the recent date of its erection.

The volume carries well chosen illustrations, among other a portrait of Mother Stanislaus, so Madonna-like that it cannot but be a joy to all beholders; and there are statistical appendices, a fine index and an appalling bibliography, which witnesses how Sister has left no stone unturned, no source undiscovered, and like an *apis argumentosa* has constructed a honeycomb from which food and sweetness is supplied to generations of readers in ages to come.

LAURENCE J. KENNY

The United States Since 1865, by Louis M. Hacker and the late Benjamin B. Kendrick. Fourth edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. 1949. pp. 739. \$5.00.

The fourth edition of this book, which first appeared in 1932, differs from the other editions in several ways. To the original major themes of the work—the humbling of the farmer and the emergence of imperial America, are added two more—state interventionism as exemplified by the New Deal and United States world leadership. The bibliography has been brought up to

date; additional maps and tables have been included; new chapters have been added which carry the work up to the 1948 presidential election. The so-called Robber Barons and industrial magnates of the post-Civil War period have been treated a little more kindly. Professor Hacker has slightly modified his previous position because he believes these men, regardless of bold and unscrupulous methods, created an industrial machine which was not only the wonder of the world, but "about the only means mankind has of saving civilization." Harding, Coolidge, Hoover and Mellon come in for a considerable share of criticism in this edition, as in the previous three.

In general this work differs from other "since 1865" texts in emphasis. The fact that the author is a professor of economics speaks for itself, but it should be noted that an unusual amount of space is devoted to religion, learning, art, philanthropy and the like. As the author gets closer to the present day he becomes more thorough and detailed, believing evidently that the present rests most heavily on the immediate past.

The best over-all recommendation to be made for the book is that the author never hesitates to interpret, but at the same time intends his interpretation to be provocative rather than dogmatic.

EDWARD J. MAGUIRE.

Early Jesuit Missions in Tarahumara, by Peter Masten Dunne, S. J. Berkeley and Los Angeles. University of California Press. 1948. pp. 276. \$3.75

Father Dunne is rapidly becoming the historian of Jesuit mission enterprise in colonial Mexico. The present work forms the third of his studies on the apostolic and civilizing endeavors of his brethren of yesteryear. This one continues, both chronologically and geographically, the story which he told in *Pioneer Jesuits in Northern Mexico*. The Tarahumara is the northernmost region of the present republic, lying principally in the modern State of Chihuahua.

The study has both the fine authenticity of the documents and that of actual acquaintance with the country. Father Dunne, as in previous instances, has covered the ground on which the early missionaries labored. In many respects this story is like others that he has told—the opening up of new fields, the founding of missions, revolts, destruction, and the process begun once more. There are, however, several elements of interest of a new character. Here in the Tarahumara from the late decades of the seventeenth century forward Jesuits from the "northern nations" (non-Spanish Europe) were allowed to enter the field. Men as Neumann, the fabulous Glandorff, and others bring the genius of their nationality to bear on the problems and peoples of the frontier, with interesting results.

The book ends on the sad note of the expulsion of the Black Robes from their missions in 1767 and gives the reader a picture in miniature of what was happening through the Spanish Americas in that year. It was Spanish officialdom's ungrateful way of repaying more than a century of service and the blood of more than

one Jesuit. The role of the missionary in spread and holding her vast overseas empire is much greater than is often imagined. Studies as this present give some inkling of that signal service—and, of course, it well illustrates what the frontier padres did in the interests of the Church.

JOHN F. BANNON

Slavic Civilization Through the Ages, by Samuel Hazzard Cross, ed. by Leonid A. Strakhovsky. Cambridge, Harvard University Press. 1948. pp. vi, 195. \$3.00

The sudden death of Samuel Hazzard Cross of Harvard University in October, 1946, brought to a close at the age of fifty-five a brilliant career devoted to Slavic studies. Much of Dr. Cross's research material was left in almost finished form and his colleagues were endeavoring to edit and publish as much as possible of this material.

The present book, edited by Leonid A. Strakhovsky, is based upon eight lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute of Boston in 1939. Its purpose is stated in the very first paragraph of the first lecture:

The object of this study is to provide a fairly detailed account of the Slavs from their first appearance in history to their emergence in modern times as a group of nations akin in race and language but diversified by the cultural and political influences to which they have been exposed.

The eight chapters, therefore, attempt to present an over-all view of the rise, fall and re-emergence of the three branches of the Slavic peoples: the Eastern, Western and the Southern. Tracing their histories from early beginnings, Dr. Cross has emphasized the cultural and religious influences upon the Slavs and has also noted the bases of contemporary antagonisms. Although the book is entitled "Slavic Civilization Through the Ages", most attention is directed towards the medieval background of the various branches of the Slavic family.

For a bird's-eye view of some fifteen centuries of Slavic history the book will be most useful. Because of its very nature, the study is sketchy, presenting a broad sweep of Slavic history rather than an analysis of any particular period or personality.

Inasmuch as the broad generalizations are based on a minimum of factual material, it is unfortunate that several inaccuracies have crept in. For instance, in reference to the Congress of Gnesen of the year 1000 the author noted that the diocese of Posen, originally subject to the archbishop of Magdeburg, was transferred to the archdiocese of Mainz. Recent research indicates that Posen was not originally placed under the jurisdiction of the German church, but that the bishop was a missionary bishop. In the year 1000 the archbishop of Magdeburg claimed the diocese of Posen and even presented a spurious document to support his claim, but in 1013 Posen was incorporated into the Polish church, under the archbishop of Gnesen.

Similarly, reference is made (p. 79) to a marriage between the Russian princess Maria and King Kizim of Poland. The Polish ruler, whose name should have been spelled, as it elsewhere is, Kazimir, was not a king but rather a duke. The German king had deposed

and of the royal crown in 1033 and the rulers, as
als of Germany, were dukes.

On p. 135 the date for the dissolution of the Teu-
c Order is given as 1559. Actually the Teutonic
er was dissolved in 1525, while the Livonian Order
ch continued to operate in the Baltic regions was
larized in 1561. The text apparently has reference
he latter dissolution. Finally, the Peace of Karlovcy,
er known as the Peace of Carlowitz, was signed in
9 rather than in 1689 (p. 164).

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Popular History of the Catholic Church, First Ameri-
an edition, by Phillip Hughes. New York. Mac-
millan. pp. xii, 294. \$3.50.

The author of a history of the Catholic Church,
n the time of its inception to the present day, pro-
es for himself a tremendous task if he limits himself
a small volume. To render it in anyway complete,
yet be brief, accurate, clear and popular is a job
t has often been attempted but is rarely successful.
it seems to me that Fr. Hughes is quite successful.
he himself states in the first chapter, he "will give
more than a very general impression of leading
nts, of tendencies, and of the personalities that shaped
m and were shaped by them." This he does with
ad, swift strokes, picturing that vast panorama of
nts, of conflicts and struggles, of ideals and expedi-
s, of victories and defeats that form the history of
Church. With so much to tell, the author still
nages to keep the reader's interest, both by his selec-
a, interpretation and analysis of facts, as well as by
graceful style and the command of language. The
ition of a brief general bibliography is of service to
h the scholar and the layman, and the inclusion
a good index and excellent chronological tables
kes the book a handy reference tool. If the book is
be an "American edition", then the use of "our" or
e" in reference to England ought to be omitted.

ROBERT V. CALLEN.

Greater Service, The History of the Congregation
of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of
Mary, Monroe, Michigan, 1845-1945, by Sister M.
Rosalita, I.M.H., with a Foreword by His Eminence
Edward Cardinal Mooney. Detroit. Evans-Winter-
Hebb, Inc., 1948. pp. 863.

Triumph of a Century, The Motherhouse and Mis-
ions of the Congregation of the Sisters, Servants of
the Immaculate Heart of Mary, 1845-1945, edited
by Sister M. Rosalita, I.M.H. (Companion volume
to the above.) Detroit. Evans-Winter-Hobbs, Inc.
1948. pp. 299. The set \$15.00

Here is something wonderful indeed. In 1845 a
man came from Baltimore to Michigan—she was a
gro, as we use the term today—she was moreover a
man of culture who had been superior of the Oblate
ers of Providence and was consequently well versed
he spiritual life, Sister Mary Theresa Maxis. These

two very beautiful volumes, beautiful without and far
more beautiful within, commemorate her coming and
the glorious results of her labors and particularly of
her sufferings. More than three thousand Sisters, Serv-
ants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and perhaps as
many more who have gone to join her in heaven, are
her spiritual daughters.

When the writer of this criticism a few years ago
passed by Marygrove College in Detroit, than which
there is no school for women, Catholic or non-Catholic
in all the world, of superior scholarship, he was given
to understand that the Sisters were reticent about the
racial character of their foundress. That must have
been a mistake. For here it is blazoned forth at the
outset of the first of these volumes. And well it may
be for she was such a woman as not only this Congre-
gation but the universal church and all mankind may
be proud of.

The second of these volumes carries a Dedication:
"To the glorious patrons of the Congregation—Jesus,
Mary, Alphonsus, and Theresa—and to the pioneer
women who, walking in the light of their guidance,
raised a temple of living stones to the Eternal God."

It is clear to the reader which St. Alphonsus is
meant—the founder of the Redemptorist priests who
have ever been the faithful guardians of this Congre-
gation; but it is not so clear which Theresa is the
patron referred to. Great among the saints of God is
Theresa of Avila, great too is Theresa, the Little Flower;
but the Sisters have a Theresa of their own who is
worthy, in the opinion of this critic, to stand in a
heavenly trinity with those two "valiant women".

For the rest, Sister Rosalita's volumes follow the
blueprint of the various similar accounts of the origin
and growth of our religious congregations in America.
They are all works of fine scholarship telling of begin-
ning like those of Bethlehem and a development like
that of the Catholic Church, everywhere battling for
existence, always triumphant.

LAURENCE J. KENNY.

Book Notices

St. Anthony of Padua, Doctor of the Church Universal,
by Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M. Conv. Milwaukee.
The Bruce Publishing Company. 1948. pp. 209.
\$3.75

This is a book for the theologian, rather than for the
historian. However, in so far as the latter must be
interested in the thought of great men and the impact
which that thought has had upon an age or upon men
of later times, he will welcome this careful analysis and
evaluation of the intellectual contribution of the be-
loved Franciscan of the thirteenth century. It will also
help him to understand—something not always too
easy for the uninitiated—what is involved in the title
"Doctor of the Church," which has been accorded to
certain great figures whom he encounters along history's
path.

J. F. B.

Pioneer Days in Idaho County, Volume One, by Sister M. Alfreda Elsensohn, O.S.B. Caldwell, Idaho. The Caxton Printers. 1947. pp. 527, illustrated. \$7.50

Through a careful and, one should add, loving search into the varied sources of the past, the author has turned up a vast amount of material with which she has built a fascinating story of her native county. Idaho County is the largest of the ten into which the northern or "panhandle" section of the State is divided. It has had a fulsome history, which is here told with charm and skill. Place names and the associations which they evoked furnished the initial inspiration for the study. A second volume to complete the study is promised for the future. J. F. B.

The Christian Churches of the East, Volume II, by Donald Attwater. Milwaukee. The Bruce Publishing Company. 1947. pp. 290. \$4.00

This is the second volume of the author's revision of two earlier works. Herein he treats of the Dissident Eastern Churches, those, namely, which have broken from communion with Rome but have, nonetheless, preserved the Catholic faith, to varying degrees, almost in its entirety. The emphasis is on the present status and organization of these churches, with statistics brought up to date, though there is much historical and theological material included. Mr. Attwater's long study of the Christianities of the East makes him a sound and trustworthy interpreter. J. F. B.

Rural Life in Argentina, by Carl C. Taylor. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1948. pp. xx, 464. \$6.00

This is an interesting and a valuable study of the peoples and the problems of a nation in which rural life is of prime importance. It has grown out of on-the-scene observation by an expert in the rural life field. The book will be of high value to sociologists, nor is it without its distinct value to the historian of the other Americas. For the latter there are several chapters, particularly those on "The People of Argentina," on "Immigrants and Their Influence," on "The Settling and Peopling of the Country," which should have a special worth. J. F. B.

Guns on the Western Waters, by H. Allen Gosnell. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1949. pp. xii, 273. \$6.50

Mr. Gosnell has produced here his fifth volume on naval history and operations. In it he deals with the comparatively unexplored field of the activity of gunboats on the Mississippi River and its tributaries during the Civil War.

While the topic is one of interest and of value, the usefulness of this volume is marred by certain features, notably the absence of an index and the use of extended direct quotations from eye-witnesses and participants in various actions. This device is, of course, valid and adds to the color of the narrative. However, for the student of the period, a more concise and informative method of presentation might be preferable. J. W. C.

Lincoln Under Enemy Fire, the Complete Account of the Experiences During Early's Attack on Washington, John Henry Cramer. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1948. pp. xv, 138. \$2.50

This is an interesting little volume, serving its purpose of filling out another era in the life of Abraham Lincoln. Its particular field is the incident in which Lincoln, exposed to enemy fire in Jubal Early's attack at Fort Stevens, was presumably ordered by Captain (later Justice) Oliver Wendell Holmes to "Get down you fool!"

Mr. Cramer presents numerous eye-witness accounts, letters and recollections of the episode. No conclusion is reached, but an excellent exercise in examination of source material is performed.

This volume will constitute an entertaining, but too important addition to the rapidly-growing shelves of Lincolniana. J. W. C.

The Teaching of the Catholic Church, arranged and edited by Canon George D. Smith, 2 volumes. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1949. pp. 1316. \$12.00

This is a work which can prove very valuable as a reference work to the historian, Catholic and otherwise, who in the course of his study, teaching, or writing needs information on or clarification of the Catholic position. The essays which make up these two volumes were originally issued in the *Treasury of the Fathers* series. J. F. B.

The Deer Cry, by William G. Schofield. New York. Toronto. Longmans, Green and Co. 1948. pp. 307. \$3.00

The author has woven an interesting tale which he himself describes as "a novel of Patrick of Eirinn." He has written with a novelist's liberties, but, like many men of his craft who today treat historical characters, he has been careful to bulwark the fictional with solid research and careful study. J. F. B.

Books Received

A Study of Reflections of the Peace Proposals of Pope Pius XII in the Writings of David Lawrence, by Sister Catherine Johnson Wilcox, S. P. Milwaukee. Marquette University Press. 1949. pp. 95.

Recapitulation, A Reprint of Student Articles Published in National Magazines, 1938-1948, edited by Sister M. Honora. Detroit. Marygrove College. 1949. pp. 96.

Men, Mutts, and Mulligan, and Other Stories, by Quentin Morrell Phillip. Chicago. Saint Joseph Publishing Company. 1949. pp. 62. \$1.25.

The Heresy of Courtly Love, by Alexander J. Denomy, C.S.C., with introduction by William Lane Keleher, S.J. (Baltimore. College Candlemas Lectures on Christian Literature.) New York. The Declan X. McMullen Company. 1947. pp. 150.

As We Ought, by Vincent P. McCorry, S.J. New York. Declan X. McMullen Company. 1949. pp. 236. \$2.75

To Heaven Through a Window, The Life of St. Gerard Majella, by John Carr, C.S.S.R. New York. The Declan X. McMullen Company. 1949. pp. 303. \$3.50

That I May See, by Leo J. Walter, O. Carm. New York. Declan X. McMullen Company. 1949. pp. 138. \$1.75

The Philosophy of Existence, by Gabriel Marcel. New York. Philosophical Library. 1949. pp. 96. \$2.75